

PROJECTIVE COMPACTNESS AND CONFORMAL BOUNDARIES

ANDREAS ČAP AND A. ROD GOVER

ABSTRACT. Let $\overline{M}$ be a smooth manifold with boundary ∂M and interior M . Consider an affine connection ∇ on M for which the boundary is at infinity. Then ∇ is projectively compact of order α if the projective structure defined by ∇ smoothly extends to all of $\overline{M}$ in a specific way that depends on no particular choice of boundary defining function. Via the Levi-Civita connection, this concept applies to pseudo-Riemannian metrics on M . We study the relation between interior geometry and the possibilities for compactification, and then develop the tools that describe the induced geometry on the boundary.

We prove that a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M which is projectively compact of order two admits a certain asymptotic form. This form was known to be sufficient for projective compactness, so the result establishes that it provides an equivalent characterization.

From a projectively compact connection on M , one obtains a projective structure on $\overline{M}$, which induces a conformal class of (possibly degenerate) bundle metrics on the tangent bundle to the hypersurface ∂M . Using the asymptotic form, we prove that in the case of metrics, which are projectively compact of order two, this boundary structure is always non-degenerate. We also prove that in this case the metric is necessarily asymptotically Einstein, in a natural sense.

Finally, a non-degenerate boundary geometry gives rise to a (conformal) standard tractor bundle endowed with a canonical linear connection, and we explicitly describe these in terms of the projective data of the interior geometry.

Both authors gratefully acknowledge support from the Royal Society of New Zealand via Marsden Grant 13-UOA-018; AČ gratefully acknowledges support by projects P23244-N13 and P27072-N25 of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) and also the hospitality of the University of Auckland.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a smooth manifold $\overline{M}$ with boundary ∂M and interior M . The study of geometric structures on ∂M induced by complete Riemannian (or pseudo-Riemannian) metrics on M , and of the relation between asymptotic data on M and data on ∂M , has a long history that includes interesting applications in mathematics and physics, e.g. [12, 21, 24]. A model case for this situation is provided by conformally compact metrics on M , i.e. complete metrics for which an appropriate conformal rescaling extends to the boundary. Such a metric gives rise to a well defined conformal class of metrics on ∂M , which then is referred to as the conformal infinity of the interior metric. Originating and flourishing in

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* MSC2010: Primary 53A20, 53B21, 53B10; Secondary 35N10, 53A30, 58J60.

general relativity (see e.g. [13, 18, 19, 27, 28]), this concept has also found important applications in geometric scattering theory ([22, 25, 26]) and the conjectural AdS–CFT correspondence in physics ([1, 14]). If one in addition requires the conformally compact metric on M to be negative Einstein, one arrives at the notion of a Poincaré–Einstein metric. Realizing a given conformal class on a manifold formally as the conformal infinity of a Poincaré–Einstein metric is closely related to the Fefferman–Graham conformal ambient metric construction [16, 17], and so provides a central tool for generating conformal invariants.

In fact the ambient metric construction is most directly related to projective differential geometry. As part of a discussion of this point in [17, Chapter 4] Fefferman and Graham present a certain asymptotic form for pseudo–Riemannian metrics, which they call projectively compact, and they observe that appropriate projective modifications of the Levi–Civita connections of these admit smooth extensions to the boundary. They did not go further into the relations to projective differential geometry, however. On the other hand, in the classical and visionary articles [29, 30], Schouten and Haantjes develop a construction essentially equivalent to the ambient metric, but based on projective differential geometry.

In another case of the implicit use of projective geometry, a replacement of conformal compactification by projective compactification is the geometric move underlying the significant advances in the microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic and de Sitter spaces recently developed by Vasy in [31, 32].

Projective compactification is potentially extremely powerful. For example, many natural equations in pseudo–Riemannian geometry are projectively invariant, and hence their solutions will be well behaved toward infinity in the case of projectively compact metrics. In contrast to this, such solutions will not be well behaved on, for example, conformally compact manifolds. Indeed we exploit such properties for certain equations in the current work. However in this article the focus is on further development of the foundational theory of compactification. In particular we establish fundamental results linking the asymptotics of the interior geometry to the different possibilities for projective compactification.

Guided by examples arising from reductions of projective holonomy (see [8, 9]), a conceptual approach to projective compactness was developed in our article [6]. The basic idea there was to start with a linear connection ∇ on M and use local defining functions for the boundary to define projective modifications of ∇ which are then required to admit a smooth extension to the boundary. Applying this to the Levi–Civita connection, the concept is automatically defined for pseudo–Riemannian metrics. It turns out that it is natural to involve a real parameter $\alpha > 0$, called the order of projective compactness. For a local defining function ρ for the boundary (see Section 2.2 for detailed definitions) projective compactness of ∇ of order α then is the requirement that, if two vector fields ξ and η are smooth up to the boundary, then

$$\hat{\nabla}_{\xi}\eta = \nabla_{\xi}\eta + \frac{1}{\alpha\rho}d\rho(\xi)\eta + \frac{1}{\alpha\rho}d\rho(\eta)\xi$$

admits a smooth extension to the boundary. In the case of connections preserving a volume density, the order α measures the growth of that volume density towards the boundary. The main cases of interest are $\alpha = 1$ and $\alpha = 2$.

In case that $2/\alpha$ is an integer, the article [6] describes an asymptotic form of a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M which is sufficient for projective compactness of order α . In the case $\alpha = 2$, which will be the case of main interest for this article, this asymptotic form is given by

$$g = \frac{h}{\rho} + \frac{C d\rho^2}{\rho^2}.$$

Here ρ is a local defining function for the boundary, C is a nowhere vanishing function which is smooth up to the boundary and asymptotically constant in a certain sense, and h is a symmetric $\binom{0}{2}$ -tensor field, which is smooth up to the boundary and whose boundary value is non-degenerate in directions tangent to the boundary. The metrics introduced by Fefferman and Graham, as described above, are the class of these with $C = 1$.

In this article our first aim is to treat the more difficult problem of establishing necessary conditions for projective compactness (of order 2). Certain reductions of projective holonomy give rise to examples of projectively compact connections, and for $\alpha = 2$, the resulting connections are exactly the Levi-Civita connections of non-Ricci-flat Einstein metrics. In this case, we have proved in [6] that an asymptotic form as above is always available, with the function C being a constant related to the Einstein constant. One of the main results of this article is Theorem 7 which shows that the asymptotic form (with constant C) is available for *any* pseudo-Riemannian metric that is projectively compact of order two. Hence the asymptotic form can be used as an equivalent definition of projective compactness in this case.

This result is proved in Section 2. The main ingredient for the proof is that for any projectively compact connection ∇ on M the projective structure defined by ∇ admits a smooth extension to $\overline{M}$. Hence the tools of projective differential geometry, in particular tractor bundles and tractor connections, all admit smooth extensions to $\overline{M}$. These can be used to prove that solutions to certain projectively invariant differential equations automatically extend smoothly to all of $\overline{M}$. These smooth extensions are the main ingredient in our analysis. In particular, we obtain that the scalar curvature of g admits a smooth extension to all of $\overline{M}$ and is asymptotic to a non-zero constant. This nicely complements our result from [7] that extension of the projective structure of the Levi-Civita connection of a pseudo-Riemannian metric together with this type of asymptotic behavior of the scalar curvature forces the metric to be projectively compact of order two. Thus for pseudo-Riemannian metrics with a projective structure that extends to a boundary at infinity, projective compactness of order 2 (which may be interpreted as a certain volume growth) is equivalent to the scalar curvature having a non-zero limit at the boundary. This limit is then necessarily constant along the boundary.

The fact that the projective structure defined by a projectively compact connection or metric extends to all of $\overline{M}$ also gives rise to an induced geometric structure on the boundary ∂M . As a hypersurface in a projective manifold, ∂M inherits a

symmetric $\binom{0}{2}$ -tensor field, which is well defined up to conformal rescaling. This “projective second fundamental form” is the main object of study in Section 3 of this article.

We first show that the projective second fundamental form can be described in terms of the asymptotic behavior of the Schouten-tensor (or equivalently the Ricci-tensor), see Proposition 8. This leads to results on the asymptotic behavior of the curvature of a projectively compact affine connection, as given in Proposition 9. On the other hand, for metrics which are projectively compact of order two, one can analyse the boundary geometry in terms of the asymptotic form provided by Theorem 7. In this case we prove, in Proposition 10, that the projective second fundamental form is non-degenerate and thus induces a pseudo-Riemannian conformal structure on ∂M . Together these results lead to a finer description of the curvature of such a metric. In particular, in Theorem 11 we deduce that such a metric satisfies an asymptotic version of the Einstein equation. Proposition 10 also proves that for metrics with the asymptotic form sufficient for projective compactness of order $\alpha < 2$, the boundary is necessarily totally geodesic; so the implications of projective compactness for the extrinsic geometry of the boundary change sharply at $\alpha = 2$.

In Section 4, we continue the study of the boundary geometry induced by a connection which is projectively compact of order two, assuming that the projective second fundamental form is non-degenerate. By our results, this is always satisfied for Levi-Civita connections, in general it can be characterized in terms of the asymptotics of the Schouten tensor. Under these assumptions, the boundary inherits a pseudo-Riemannian conformal structure, which can therefore be described in terms of (conformal) tractors. In the case of the Levi-Civita connection of a non-Ricci-flat Einstein metric, one can use the general theory of holonomy reductions to show that there is a simple relation between conformal tractors on the boundary and projective tractors in the interior [8, 9]. The main aim of Section 4 is to show that, although the relation is considerably more complicated in general (which is not surprising in view of the rather intricate relation between the geometries on M and on ∂M), it can still be described explicitly as follows.

The first main result is that in the general setting it is still the case that the conformal standard tractor bundle of the boundary may be naturally identified with the restriction to the boundary of the projective standard tractor bundle $\mathcal{T}$. This is proved in Proposition 12. This statement requires understanding how the conformal tractor metric arises. The projectively compact connection gives rise to a canonical defining density τ for the boundary, and applying the BGG splitting operator to this density, one obtains a bundle metric $L(\tau)$ on the projective standard tractor bundle. This bundle metric can then be analyzed similarly to the one obtained from the metricity solution in Section 2. We first prove non-degeneracy of this along ∂M , so the boundary value defines a bundle metric on the restriction of the projective standard tractor bundle to ∂M . This is also established in Proposition 12 and it is noted there that using this with the natural filtration of $\mathcal{T}$ we obtain the usual filtration of the conformal tractor bundle and tractor metric $L(\tau)$ is seen to be compatible with conformal metric.

The next main result is Theorem 14 which shows that if the projective tractor covariant derivative of $L(\tau)$ vanishes at the boundary then the normal conformal tractor connection on the boundary arises as simply a pullback of the projective tractor connection.

Finally, we treat the general case and describe how the conformal standard tractor connection on ∂M can be constructed from the projective standard tractor connection on $\overline{M}$ in two steps. First one can construct a torsion free tractor connection on all of $\overline{M}$, which is metric for the given bundle metric. Restricting this to the boundary, a final step of normalization leads in Theorem 17 to the conformal standard tractor connection. Several simplifications in particular cases (for example for projectively compact pseudo-Riemannian metrics) are discussed along the way.

2. NECESSITY OF ASYMPTOTIC FORM

We start by reviewing the concept of projective compactness from [6], as defined for any affine connection. Following this move to the setting where the interior is equipped with a metric. So given a manifold $\overline{M}$ with boundary ∂M and interior M , we assume that we have given a pseudo-Riemannian metric g on M such that the projective structure determined by the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of g smoothly extends to $\overline{M}$. We then specialize to the case that ∇ is projectively compact of order $\alpha = 2$ and our aim is to prove that this implies a certain asymptotic form for g . The key towards proving this is to analyze the consequences of the existence of a projectively compact Levi-Civita connection in the projective class in terms of tractors.

2.1. Projective compactness. Throughout this article, smooth means C^∞ , we consider a smooth manifold $\overline{M}$ with boundary ∂M and interior M . By a local defining function for ∂M we mean a smooth function $\rho : U \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined on an open subset of $\overline{M}$ such that $\rho^{-1}(\{0\}) = U \cap \partial M$ and $d\rho(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in U \cap \partial M$. By $\mathcal{E}(w)$ we will denote the bundle of densities of projective weight w . Putting these notions together leads to the concept of a *defining density of weight w* . We will only need this notion locally. On an open set U of $\overline{M}$, this is a section σ of $\mathcal{E}(w)$ which is of the form $\rho \hat{\sigma}$ for a local defining function ρ for ∂M and a section $\hat{\sigma}$ of $\mathcal{E}(w)$ which is nowhere vanishing on U .

Given an affine connection ∇ and a one-form Υ on some manifold, we will write $\hat{\nabla} = \nabla + \Upsilon$ for the projectively modified connection defined by

$$(1) \quad \hat{\nabla}_\xi \eta = \nabla_\xi \eta + \Upsilon(\xi)\eta + \Upsilon(\eta)\xi,$$

for vector fields ξ and η . Two connections are related in this way if and only if they have the same geodesics up to parameterization.

Now in the setting of a manifold with boundary, $\overline{M} = M \cup \partial M$, a linear connection ∇ on TM is called *projectively compact of order $\alpha > 0$* if and only if for any point $x \in \partial M$, there is a local defining function ρ for ∂M defined on a neighborhood U of x , such that the projectively modified connection $\hat{\nabla} = \nabla + \frac{d\rho}{\alpha\rho}$ admits

a smooth extension from $U \cap M$ to all of U . This means that for all vector fields ξ, η which are smooth up to the boundary, also

$$\hat{\nabla}_\xi \eta = \nabla_\xi \eta + \frac{1}{\alpha\rho} d\rho(\xi)\eta + \frac{1}{\alpha\rho} d\rho(\eta)\xi$$

admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Equivalently, the Christoffel symbols of $\hat{\nabla}$ in some local chart have to admit such an extension.

It is easily verified that this condition is independent of the choice of the defining function ρ , i.e. if the projective modification associated to ρ extends, then also the one associated to any other defining function is smooth up to the boundary. On the other hand, the parameter α cannot be eliminated. Indeed, it turns out that for connections which are *special*, i.e. preserve a volume density, α controls the growth of a parallel volume density towards the boundary, see section 2.2 of [6]. The result on volume growth can be nicely reformulated in terms of defining densities. If ∇ is projectively compact of order α and preserves a volume density, then for each w , the density bundle $\mathcal{E}(w)$ admits non-zero parallel sections. However, precisely for $w = \alpha$, such a section can be extended by zero to a defining density for ∂M . It is also the case that, for connections preserving a volume density, projective compactness of order α is equivalent to the fact that the projective structure of ∇ extends to all of $\overline{M}$ plus the appropriate rate of volume growth, see Proposition 2.3 of [6]. As in most of [6] we will restrict to the case $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ in this article. For this range of α the boundary is at infinity, see Proposition 2.4 in [6].

2.2. Metricity of projective structures and tractors. Here and below we use abstract index notation and the convention that adding “(w)” to the name of a vector bundle indicates a tensor product with the density bundle $\mathcal{E}(w)$.

Given a smooth manifold of dimension $n+1$ endowed with a projective structure, one can construct a vector bundle $\mathcal{T}^*$ of rank $n+2$, which contains the bundle $\mathcal{E}_a(1)$ of weighted one-forms as a smooth subbundle such that the quotient is isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}(1)$. This so-called *standard cotractor bundle* can be canonically endowed with a linear connection $\nabla^{\mathcal{T}^*}$ determined by the projective structure [2]. Together, the configuration of bundle, subbundle and connection is uniquely determined up to isomorphism. One can then apply constructions with vector bundles and induced connections to obtain general tractor bundles, each of which is endowed with a canonical tractor connection. In particular, the standard tractor bundle $\mathcal{T}$ is the dual bundle to $\mathcal{T}^*$. We will mainly need the bundles $S^2\mathcal{T}^*$ and $S^2\mathcal{T}$ of symmetric bilinear forms on $\mathcal{T}$ respectively $\mathcal{T}^*$.

Writing the composition series for $\mathcal{T}^*$ from above as $\mathcal{T}^* = \mathcal{E}_a(1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(1)$, one can describe the induced composition series for the other tractor bundles mentioned above as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \mathcal{E}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{E}^a(-1) \\ (2) \quad S^2\mathcal{T} &= \mathcal{E}(-2) \oplus \mathcal{E}^a(-2) \oplus \mathcal{E}^{(ab)}(-2) \\ S^2\mathcal{T}^* &= \mathcal{E}_{(ab)}(2) \oplus \mathcal{E}_a(2) \oplus \mathcal{E}(2). \end{aligned}$$

A choice of connection in the projective class gives rise to an isomorphism $\mathcal{T}^* \cong \mathcal{E}_a(1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(1)$ and likewise for the other tractor bundles. Given such a choice, we

write sections of a tractor bundle as column vectors with the component describing the canonical quotient of the tractor bundle on top and the component in the canonical subbundle in the bottom. Changing the connection projectively by a one-form Υ_a , there are explicit formulae for the changes of these identifications. For the bundles $S^2\mathcal{T}$ and $S^2\mathcal{T}^*$ we follow the conventions from [6], and the corresponding formulae for these cases are given as equations (3.5) and (3.11) in that reference.

Via the so-called BGG-machinery (see [11], [3], and the sketch in [6]), each tractor bundle induces a natural differential operator acting on sections of its canonical quotient bundle, which defines an overdetermined system of PDEs (“first BGG-equation”) on that bundle. Closely related to this is the so-called *splitting operator* L , which maps sections of the quotient bundle to sections of the tractor bundle.

We first need the application of these ideas to the metricity equation for projective structures, see [15]. This corresponds to the tractor bundle $S^2\mathcal{T}$. Take a projective manifold N and a pseudo-Riemannian metric g_{ab} on N with inverse g^{ab} . Then g canonically determines a volume density on N , and forming an appropriate power of this density one obtains a nowhere-vanishing section $\tau \in \mathcal{E}(2)$, which is parallel for the Levi-Civita connection of g . It then turns out that the Levi-Civita connection of g lies in the given projective class if and only if $\tau^{-1}g^{ab}$ is a solution of the metricity equation. The crucial fact for what follows is that this can be characterized in terms of its image under the splitting operator. Indeed, in [15], the authors construct a natural modification ∇^p of the tractor connection on $S^2\mathcal{T}$ such that $\tau^{-1}g^{ab}$ solves the metricity equation if and only if $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ is parallel for this modified connection. In fact, such connections can be constructed for any tractor bundle (associated to any parabolic geometry), see [23].

An explicit formula for the splitting operator L is derived in Proposition 3.1 of [10] (unfortunately with a sign error in the printed version, that is easily corrected). Given $\sigma^{ab} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^{(ab)}(-2))$ and a connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ in the projective class, the formula for $L(\sigma^{ab})$ in the splitting determined by $\tilde{\nabla}$ on a manifold of dimension $n+1$ is given by

$$(3) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^{ab} \\ -\frac{1}{n+2}\tilde{\nabla}_d\sigma^{dc} \\ \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)}\tilde{\nabla}_d\tilde{\nabla}_e\sigma^{de} + \frac{1}{n+1}\mathbf{P}_{de}\sigma^{de} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using this, one obtains the following fundamental result that has been proved in [7]. We include the proof for completeness.

Proposition 1. *Let $\overline{M}$ be a smooth manifold with boundary ∂M and interior M . Suppose g_{ab} is a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M such that the projective structure of its Levi-Civita connection ∇ admits a smooth extension to all of $\overline{M}$.*

Then the corresponding solution $\tau^{-1}g^{ab} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}^{(ij)}(-2)|_M)$ of the metricity equation and the scalar curvature $S \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$ of g both admit smooth extensions to all of $\overline{M}$.

Proof. Since the projective structure of ∇ extends to all of $\overline{M}$, all projective tractor bundles and tractor connections are defined on all of $\overline{M}$. The same holds for the modification ∇^p of the tractor connection on $S^2\mathcal{T}$ from [15].

Now over M , we can apply the splitting operator to obtain a section $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ of the bundle $S^2\mathcal{T}$. Since $\tau^{-1}g^{ab}$ satisfies the metricity equation, this section is parallel for ∇^p over M , so we can extend it by parallel transport to a smooth section of $S^2\mathcal{T}$ over all of $\overline{M}$, which is still parallel for ∇^p . Projecting this to a section of the quotient bundle $\mathcal{E}^{(ab)}(-2)$, we obtain the required extension of $\tau^{-1}g^{ab}$.

On the other hand, we can view $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ as a smooth bundle metric on $\mathcal{T}^*$ (defined over all of $\overline{M}$). Forming the determinant of the Gram matrix of this bundle metric with respect to local frames of $\mathcal{T}^*$ gives rise to a well defined section of the bundle $(\Lambda^{n+2}\mathcal{T}^*)^2$. Now this bundle is always trivial and the linear connection inherited from the tractor connection is flat, so up to an overall non-zero constant factor, this determinant is a well defined smooth function on $\overline{M}$.

Over M , we can work in the splitting determined by ∇ . Since both g^{ij} and τ^{-1} are parallel for ∇ over M , we conclude from (3) that, over M and in the splitting corresponding to ∇ , we have

$$(4) \quad L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau^{-1}g^{ab} & \\ & 0 \\ \frac{1}{n+1}\tau^{-1}g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij} & \end{pmatrix}$$

Hence over M , the determinant of $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ is given by $\tau^{-n-2}\det(g^{ab})g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij}$. By definition, $\tau^{-n-2}\det(g^{ab}) = 1$, whence $\det(L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab}))$ is a non-zero multiple of S , thus providing the required extension. $\square$

2.3. The case of projective compactness of order two. We next assume that the metric g_{ab} on M is projectively compact of order two in the sense introduced in [6]. By definition this means that, for any local defining function ρ for the boundary ∂M , we get a distinguished projective modification ${}^\rho\nabla$ of ∇ , which admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Recall that this modification is associated to the one-form $\Upsilon = \frac{1}{2\rho}d\rho$, and so for vector fields ξ and η which are smooth up to the boundary also the vector field

$$\nabla_\xi\eta + \frac{1}{2\rho}d\rho(\xi)\eta + \frac{1}{2\rho}d\rho(\eta)\xi$$

admits a smooth extension of the boundary.

There is a second crucial consequence of projective compactness of order two. Namely the non-vanishing density $\tau \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}(2)|_M)$ can be smoothly extended by zero to all of $\overline{M}$ and then becomes a defining density for ∂M , see Proposition 2.3 of [6]. In terms of a defining function ρ as above, this means that $\tau = \rho\hat{\tau}$, where $\hat{\tau}$ is parallel for ${}^\rho\nabla$ and nowhere vanishing.

Using these facts we can now analyze the extensions guaranteed by Proposition 1.

Proposition 2. *In the setting of Proposition 1, assume in addition that g_{ab} is projectively compact of order 2. Then the zero set of the boundary value of the*

smooth extension of S has empty interior. Hence the boundary value of $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ is non-degenerate on a dense open subset of ∂M .

Proof. For a local defining function ρ for ∂M , we get the connection ${}^\rho\nabla$, which is smooth up to the boundary. Hence if we express $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ over M in the splitting determined by ${}^\rho\nabla$, Proposition 1 implies that all slots will admit a smooth extension to the boundary. We use Formula (4) from the proof of Proposition 1 together with the formula (3.11) in Section 3.6 of [6] and the fact that $\Upsilon_a = \frac{1}{2\rho}\rho_a$, where $\rho_a = d\rho$. This shows that over M in the splitting determined by ${}^\rho\nabla$, we get

$$(5) \quad L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau^{-1}g^{ab} & \\ \frac{-1}{2\rho}\tau^{-1}g^{ci}\rho_i & \\ \frac{1}{n+1}\tau^{-1}g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij} + \frac{1}{4\rho^2}\tau^{-1}g^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\tau^{-1} = \frac{1}{\rho}\hat{\tau}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\tau}^{-1}$ is nowhere vanishing, we conclude that $\frac{1}{\rho}g^{ab}$, $\frac{1}{\rho^2}g^{ai}\rho_i$ and

$$\frac{1}{\rho} \left(\frac{1}{n+1}g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij} + \frac{1}{4\rho^2}g^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j \right)$$

admit smooth extensions to the boundary. But from Proposition 1 and the fact that $\frac{1}{\rho^2}g^{ai}\rho_i$ extends, we conclude that already the sum in the bracket in the last displayed formula admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Thus we conclude that this extension has to vanish along the boundary, so $\frac{1}{4\rho^2}g^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j$ approaches $\frac{-1}{n+1}g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij}$ at the boundary.

We can phrase the information we have obtained so far in terms of the matrix expression for the inverse metric g^{ab} with respect to a local frame for T^*M which is smooth up to the boundary and has ρ_a as its first element. Since $\frac{1}{\rho^2}g^{ai}\rho_i$ admits a smooth extension, the elements in the first row and in the first column of this matrix can be written as $\rho^2 a^{1j}$ (respectively $\rho^2 a^{j1}$) for functions $a^{1j} = a^{j1}$ which are smooth up to the boundary. On the other hand, since $\frac{1}{\rho}g^{ab}$ admits a smooth extension, the other entries in the matrix can all be written as ρa^{ij} , where again $a^{ij} = a^{ji}$ is smooth up to the boundary.

With a view towards contradiction, assume that the boundary value of S vanishes on an open subset of ∂M . Restricting to an appropriate open subset in $\overline{M}$, we can assume that S vanishes identically. Thus $g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij}$ vanishes along the boundary, so from above we conclude that $\frac{1}{\rho^2}g^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j$ vanishes along the boundary. Thus we can write $g^{ij}\rho_i\rho_j$ as $\rho^3 a^{11}$ where a^{11} is smooth up to the boundary. Forming $\det(g^{ij})$ we see that we can first take a factor ρ^2 out of the first row and then a factor ρ out of each of the other rows, and then still a factor ρ out of the first column, so $\det(g^{ij}) = \rho^{2+n+1} \det(a^{ij})$. On the other hand, the results on volume asymptotics from Proposition 2.3 of [6] show that, viewed as a density, $\det(g_{ij}) = \rho^{-n-2}\hat{\nu}$ where $\hat{\nu}$ is smooth up to the boundary. Multiplying we see that $1 = \rho \det(a_{ij})$ which contradicts the fact that $\det(a^{ij})$ is smooth up to the boundary. $\square$

2.4. The inverse of the metricity tractor. Knowing that the boundary value of S is non-zero on a dense open subset of ∂M , we know that the metricity tractor $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ is a non-degenerate bundle metric on a neighborhood of this subset in $\overline{M}$. Hence we can form its inverse there, and this is a section Φ of $S^2\mathcal{T}^*$ which

is smooth up to the boundary and non-degenerate. This leads to fundamental information on the asymptotic behavior of the metric g_{ab} .

Proposition 3. *Let g be a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M which is projectively compact of order 2. Let $x \in \partial M$ be a point such that the boundary value of the scalar curvature S is non-zero in x , and let ρ be a defining function for ∂M which is defined on a neighborhood of x in $\overline{M}$.*

Then locally around x , the section

$$h_{ab} := \rho g_{ab} + \frac{n+1}{4\rho} (g^{ij} P_{ij})^{-1} \rho_a \rho_b$$

admits a smooth extension to the boundary and the boundary values are non-degenerate as bilinear forms on the spaces $T_y \partial M$.

Proof. Restricting to an appropriate open neighborhood U of x , we may assume that $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab}) \in \Gamma(S^2\mathcal{T})$ is non-degenerate as a bundle metric on $\mathcal{T}^*$ and hence its inverse $\Phi \in \Gamma(S^2\mathcal{T}^*)$ is a smooth non-degenerate bundle metric on $\mathcal{T}$. On $U \cap M$, we can work in the splitting associated to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of g . The expression (4) for $L(\tau^{-1}g^{ab})$ from the proof of Proposition 1 then implies that in that splitting we get

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} (n+1)\tau(g^{ij}P_{ij})^{-1} \\ 0 \\ \tau g_{ab} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2, we can now compute the expression for Φ in the splitting associated to the connection ${}^\rho\nabla$, which is defined up to the boundary. All slots in this expression then admit smooth extensions to the boundary and Φ must be non-degenerate, also along the boundary. We can compute the change of splitting from formula (3.5) in Section 3.1 of [6] using that $\Upsilon_a = \frac{1}{2\rho}\rho_a$. This shows that in the splitting associated to ${}^\rho\nabla$, we get

$$(6) \quad \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}\rho(n+1)(g^{ij}P_{ij})^{-1} \\ \hat{\tau}\frac{n+1}{2}(g^{ij}P_{ij})^{-1}\rho_a \\ \hat{\tau}(\rho g_{ab} + \frac{n+1}{4\rho}(g^{ij}P_{ij})^{-1}\rho_a\rho_b) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The bottom slot is $\hat{\tau}h_{ab}$, so we see that h_{ab} admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Along the boundary, the top slot vanishes, while the middle slot becomes a non-zero multiple of $\hat{\tau}\rho_a$. Non-degeneracy of Φ along the boundary is then equivalent to the fact that h_{ab} is non-degenerate on the kernel of the middle slot, which coincides with $T\partial M \subset TM|_{\partial M}$. $\square$

2.5. Geodetic transversals. We next discuss a natural product structure along the boundary. This can be done for affine connections which are projectively compact of arbitrary order, so we temporarily work in this more general setting.

Suppose that ∇ is a linear connection on TM , which is projectively compact of some order $\alpha > 0$, and that ρ is a local defining function for the boundary ∂M , defined on an open set $U \subset \overline{M}$. Then by definition the affine connection $\nabla + \frac{d\rho}{\alpha\rho}$ defined on $U \cap M$ extends smoothly to all of U , and we again denote this connection by ${}^\rho\nabla$.

Definition 4. A *geodetic transversal* for ρ is a smooth vector field $\mu \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$ such that ${}^\rho\nabla_\mu\mu = 0$ (i.e. the flow lines of μ are geodesics for ${}^\rho\nabla$) and such that $d\rho(\mu)$ is identically one on $U \cap \partial M$.

Lemma 5. (i) Given U and ρ and a vector field μ_0 along $U \cap \partial M$ such that $d\rho(\mu_0) = 1$ on $U \cap \partial M$, we can (possibly shrinking U) extend μ_0 uniquely to a geodetic transversal for ρ .

(ii) If μ is any geodetic transversal for ρ then for each point $x \in U \cap \partial M$ there is an open neighborhood $\tilde{V}$ of x in $\overline{M}$, a positive $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, and a diffeomorphism $\tilde{V} \rightarrow [0, \epsilon) \times V$ where $V = \tilde{V} \cap \partial M$, which maps each $y \in V$ to $(0, y)$, and pulls back the coordinate vector field ∂_t for the coordinate t in $[0, \epsilon)$ to μ .

Proof. Extend μ_0 to a local smooth frame for $T\overline{M}|_{\partial M}$. Denoting by $p : \mathcal{P}\overline{M} \rightarrow \overline{M}$ the linear frame bundle of $\overline{M}$ and by $\theta \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{P}\overline{M}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ its soldering form, the frame defines a smooth map $s : U \cap \partial M \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\overline{M}$ such that $p \circ s = \text{id}$.

Now ${}^\rho\nabla$ defines a principal connection on $\mathcal{P}\overline{M}$, so we can talk about horizontal vector fields on $\mathcal{P}\overline{M}$ and such a field is uniquely determined by its value under θ . In particular, let $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{P}\overline{M})$ be the horizontal vector field whose value under θ is always the first vector in the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. This means that for any frame $u \in \mathcal{P}\overline{M}$, $T_u p \cdot X(u)$ is the first element in the frame u , so in particular $T_{s(y)p} \cdot X(s(y)) = \mu_0(y)$ for all $y \in U \cap \partial M$.

Let us denote by Fl_t^X the flow of the vector field X , and consider the map $(y, t) \mapsto p(\text{Fl}_t^X(s(y)))$, which is defined and smooth on an open neighborhood of $(U \cap \partial M) \times \{0\}$ in $(U \cap \partial M) \times [0, \infty)$. Evidently, its tangent map in $(y, 0)$ restricts to the identity on $T_y \partial M$ and maps ∂_t to $\mu_0(y)$ so it is a linear isomorphism. Hence for any $y \in U \cap \partial M$, it restricts to a diffeomorphism on a set of the form $V \times [0, \epsilon)$ where $V \subset \partial M$ is an open neighborhood of y . Since the flow lines of X in $\mathcal{P}\overline{M}$ project to geodesics in M , we can define μ as the image of ∂_t under this diffeomorphism to complete the proof of (i), and use the inverse of the diffeomorphism to complete the proof of (ii). $\square$

2.6. The asymptotic form. Returning to the setting of a pseudo-Riemannian metric g which is projectively compact of order 2, we can next use a geodetic transversal to complete the description of the asymptotic behavior of the scalar curvature S of g .

Proposition 6. Let g be a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M with scalar curvature S which is projectively compact of order 2. Let $x \in \partial M$ be a point in which the boundary value of S is non-vanishing, let ρ be a local defining function for ∂M which is defined on an open neighborhood U of $x \in \overline{M}$ and suppose that μ is a geodetic transversal for ρ defined on U . Then we have:

(1) The function $\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu)$ is constant along flow lines of μ and hence admits a smooth extension to the boundary. The boundary value of this extension equals the one of $-\frac{n+1}{4}(g^{ij}P_{ij})^{-1}$.

(2) The boundary value of $\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu)$ is constant on a neighborhood of x .

Proof. (1) On $U \cap M$, we compute

$$\mu \cdot (\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu)) = 2\rho d\rho(\mu)g(\mu, \mu) + 2\rho^2 g(\nabla_\mu \mu, \mu).$$

We can write $\nabla_\mu \mu = {}^\rho \nabla_\mu \mu - 2\Upsilon(\mu)\mu = -\frac{1}{\rho}d\rho(\mu)\mu$, and inserting this, we see that $\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu)$ is constant along flow lines of μ .

From Proposition 3, we know that $\rho g_{ab} + \frac{n+1}{4\rho}(g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij})^{-1}\rho_a\rho_b$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Multiplying this by ρ , we obtain a tensor field which is smooth up to the boundary and vanishes along the boundary. Inserting two copies of μ into this tensor field we see that

$$\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu) + \frac{n+1}{4}(g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij})^{-1}(d\rho(\mu))^2$$

approaches zero at the boundary, and since $d\rho(\mu)$ equals one along the boundary, the proof of (1) is complete.

(2) Let $\xi = \xi^a$ be a vector field on U (so ξ is smooth up to the boundary), such that $d\rho(\xi)$ vanishes identically. Then Proposition 3 immediately implies that for any vector field $\eta \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$, the function $\rho g(\xi, \eta)$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Next, since $d\rho(\mu)$ equals one along ∂M and ξ is tangent to ∂M along ∂M , so $\xi \cdot (d\rho(\mu))$ vanishes along ∂M . Expanding $0 = d(d\rho)(\xi, \mu)$ and using that $d\rho(\xi) = 0$ we conclude that $d\rho([\xi, \mu])$ vanishes along ∂M . Again using Proposition 3, we conclude that also $\rho g([\xi, \mu], \eta)$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary for each $\eta \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$. Armed with these observations, we now compute

$$\xi \cdot (\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu)) = \rho^2 \xi \cdot g(\mu, \mu) = 2\rho^2 g(\nabla_\xi \mu, \mu) = 2\rho^2 g([\xi, \mu], \mu) + 2\rho^2 g(\nabla_\mu \xi, \mu).$$

From above we see that the first term in the right hand side admits a smooth extension to the boundary with boundary value zero. The second term on the right hand side can be written as

$$2\rho^2 \mu \cdot g(\xi, \mu) - 2\rho^2 g(\xi, \nabla_\mu \mu) = 2\rho^2 \mu \cdot g(\xi, \mu) + 2\rho d\rho(\mu)g(\xi, \mu),$$

where we have used the expression for $\nabla_\mu \mu$ obtained above. Rewriting the right hand side as $2\rho \mu \cdot (\rho g(\xi, \mu))$ we see that also this term admits a smooth extension to the boundary with boundary value zero. Hence $\xi \cdot (\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu))$ vanishes along the boundary, and since we can realize any vector field tangent to the boundary as a boundary value in this way, we see that $\rho^2 g(\mu, \mu)$ is locally constant along the boundary. $\square$

From this, we can readily deduce our first main result.

Theorem 7. *Let g be a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M , which is projectively compact of order 2. Then we have*

(1) *The smooth extension S of the scalar curvature of g to all of $\overline{M}$ guaranteed by Proposition 1 has a boundary value which is locally constant and nowhere vanishing.*

(2) *Given a boundary point $x \in \partial M$ and a local defining function ρ for ∂M , then for the non-zero constant $C = \frac{-n(n+1)}{4S(x)}$, the tensor field*

$$h_{ab} := \rho g_{ab} - \frac{C}{\rho} \rho_a \rho_b$$

admits a smooth extension to the boundary with its boundary values being non-degenerate as bilinear forms on $T\partial M$.

Proof. (1) From Propositions 1 and 6, we know that S is smooth up to the boundary, and that $S|_{\partial M}$ is non-vanishing and locally constant on a dense open subset of ∂M . This is only possible if the constant values on connected components of this open set with intersecting closures match up, and hence S extends to a locally constant function on ∂M . But of course all the constant values are non-zero, so S is nowhere vanishing.

(2) In our convention for dimensions, we have $P_{ab} = \frac{1}{n}R_{ab}$, where $R_{ab} := R_{da}{}^d{}_b$ (is the Ricci curvature) and hence $g^{ij}P_{ij} = \frac{1}{n}S$, so the claim follows immediately from Proposition 3. $\square$

3. BOUNDARY GEOMETRY AND CURVATURE ASYMPTOTICS

A projectively compact connection on the interior of a manifold with boundary induces a projective structure on the whole manifold. As a hypersurface in a projective manifold, the boundary inherits the so-called projective second fundamental form, a conformal class of bilinear forms on the tangent spaces to the boundary. After making these observations, our main aim in this section is to relate this structure on the boundary to data on the interior. We first do this for general projectively compact affine connections, showing that the projective second fundamental form is related to the asymptotics of the Schouten tensor. This leads to results on the asymptotic form of the curvature of a projectively compact connection.

With these results established, we then turn our attention to pseudo-Riemannian metrics admitting an asymptotic form from a family (depending on $\alpha \in (0, 2]$) identified in [6]; in that source it is shown that these asymptotic forms are sufficient for projective compactness. We find that the possible extrinsic boundary geometry depends on the parameter α , which gives the order of projective compactness. If the order of projective compactness is less than two, then the projective second fundamental form necessarily vanishes, so the boundary is totally geodesic. On the other hand, in the case of order two there is no such a prior restriction on the projective second fundamental form and we obtain an explicit description of this object. Note that Theorem 7 states that for metrics that are projectively compact of order 2 the asymptotic form is always available. So the results apply generally in this case. The explicit formula description found implies, in particular, that the projective second fundamental form is always non-degenerate, in the order two case, and hence defines a canonical conformal structure on the boundary. Finally, the relation to the Schouten tensor is used to prove that any such metric satisfies an asymptotic form of the Einstein equation.

3.1. The induced geometry on the boundary. Suppose that $\overline{M} = M \cup \partial M$ is a smooth manifold with boundary and that ∇ is an affine connection on M which is projective compact of some order $\alpha \in (0, 2]$. Let us recall the construction of the projectively invariant second fundamental form for the extended projective structure.

Choose a local defining function ρ for ∂M , let $\hat{\nabla}$ be any connection in the projective class which is smooth up to the boundary and consider $\hat{\nabla}d\rho \in \Gamma(S^2T\bar{M})$. Writing again ρ_a for $d\rho$, we see that for a projectively equivalent connection $\tilde{\nabla}$, we get $\tilde{\nabla}_a\rho_b = \hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b - \Upsilon_a\rho_b - \Upsilon_b\rho_a$, so $\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$ and $\tilde{\nabla}_a\rho_b$ have the same restriction to $T\partial M \times T\partial M$. On the other hand, changing the defining function ρ to $\tilde{\rho} = e^f\rho$, we get $\tilde{\rho}_a = \tilde{\rho}f_a + e^f\rho_a$, where $f_a = df$, and thus

$$\hat{\nabla}_a\tilde{\rho}_b = \tilde{\rho}_af_b + \tilde{\rho}\hat{\nabla}_af_b + e^f f_a\rho_b + e^f\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b.$$

Hence the restriction of $\hat{\nabla}_a\tilde{\rho}_b$ to $T\partial M \times T\partial M$ is conformal to the restriction of $\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$. So the (possibly degenerate) conformal class $[\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b]$ on $T\partial M$ is canonical. We will say that any positive constant multiple of $\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$ is a representative of the *projective second fundamental form*.

By construction, the projective second fundamental form only depends on the extended projective structure on the manifold $\bar{M}$ with boundary, and not on the specific projectively compact connection ∇ on M . It turns out, however, that there is a nice relation to the projectively compact connection on the interior.

Proposition 8. *Let ∇ be a linear connection on TM which is projectively compact of some order $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, and let P_{ab} be the Schouten tensor of ∇ .*

Then, for any local defining function ρ for ∂M the smooth section $\rho P_{ab} + \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha^2} \frac{\rho_a\rho_b}{\rho}$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary and its boundary value restricts to a representative of the projective second fundamental form on $T\partial M$.

Proof. Let $\hat{\nabla} = {}^\rho\nabla$ be the projective modification of ∇ associated to ρ . This means that $\hat{\nabla}_a = \nabla_a + \Upsilon_a$, with $\Upsilon_a := \frac{\rho_a}{\alpha\rho}$, admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Then of course the Schouten tensor $\hat{P}_{ab}$ of $\hat{\nabla}$ is smooth up to the boundary. The relation between P_{ab} and $\hat{P}_{ab}$ from [2] reads as

$$P_{ab} = \hat{P}_{ab} + \hat{\nabla}_a\Upsilon_b + \Upsilon_a\Upsilon_b.$$

Now $\hat{\nabla}_a(\frac{1}{\alpha\rho}\rho_b) = -\frac{1}{\alpha\rho^2}\rho_a\rho_b + \frac{1}{\alpha\rho}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$. On the other hand, $\Upsilon_a\Upsilon_b = \frac{1}{\alpha^2\rho^2}\rho_a\rho_b$, and inserting this, we get that

$$P_{ab} = \hat{P}_{ab} + \frac{1}{\alpha\rho}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b - \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha^2\rho^2}\rho_a\rho_b$$

and thus

$$(7) \quad \rho P_{ab} + \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha^2\rho}\rho_a\rho_b = \frac{1}{\alpha}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b + \rho\hat{P}_{ab}.$$

Since, the right hand side is evidently smooth up to the boundary, with boundary value $\frac{1}{\alpha}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$, the result follows. $\square$

3.2. Curvature asymptotics. We next prove a general result on the asymptotic behavior of the curvature of a connection which is projectively compact of some order $\alpha \in (0, 2]$. This is similar to the fact that conformally compact pseudo-Riemannian metrics are asymptotically hyperbolic, see for example [20].

To formulate the result, recall that from each symmetric $\binom{0}{2}$ -tensor field, one can build up a tensor having curvature symmetries by putting $R_{ab}{}^c{}_d := \delta_a^c\varphi_{bd} - \delta_b^c\varphi_{ad}$. In particular, we can apply this to $\binom{0}{2}$ -tensor fields which have rank one, i.e. are of

the form $\varphi_{ab} = \psi_a \psi_b$ for a one-form $\psi = \psi_a$. In this case we call the corresponding curvature tensor the *rank-one curvature tensor determined by ψ* .

Proposition 9. *Let ∇ be a linear connection on TM which is projectively compact of some order $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, let $R = R_{ab}{}^c{}_d$ be the curvature tensor of ∇ . Let ρ be a local defining function for ∂M and let $\hat{\nabla} = \nabla + \frac{d\rho}{\alpha\rho}$ be the associated connection in the projective class.*

(i) *If $\alpha = 1$, then ρR admits a smooth extension to the boundary with boundary value*

$$\delta_a^c \hat{\nabla}_b \rho_d - \delta_b^c \hat{\nabla}_a \rho_d.$$

(ii) *If $\alpha \neq 1$, then $\rho^2 R$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary with boundary value equal to $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha^2}$ times the rank-one curvature tensor determined by the one-form $d\rho$.*

Proof. The decomposition of the curvature tensor used in projective geometry, see section 3.1 of [2], reads as

$$R_{ab}{}^c{}_d = C_{ab}{}^c{}_d + \delta_a^c P_{bd} - \delta_b^c P_{ad} + \beta_{ab} \delta_d^c.$$

Here $C_{ab}{}^c{}_d$ is the projective Weyl curvature, P_{ab} is the projective Schouten tensor and $\beta_{ab} = P_{ba} - P_{ab}$ (so this vanishes for connections preserving a volume density). Now the projective Weyl curvature is projectively invariant, so since the projective structure extends smoothly to $\bar{M}$, $C_{ab}{}^c{}_d$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary.

We have analyzed the behavior of P_{ab} in Proposition 8. If $\alpha = 1$, then $\rho P_{ab} = \hat{\nabla}_a \rho_b + \rho \hat{P}_{ab}$, where $\hat{P}_{ab}$ is the Schouten tensor of $\hat{\nabla}_a$. Of course $\hat{P}_{ab}$ is smooth up to the boundary, and we conclude that, $\hat{\beta}_{ab} = \beta_{ab}$, so β_{ab} is smooth up to the boundary. This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) If $\alpha \neq 1$, then Proposition 8 shows that $\rho^2 P_{ab}$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary with boundary value $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha^2} \rho_a \rho_b$, so again the result follows. $\square$

3.3. Projectively compact pseudo-Riemannian metrics and asymptotic forms. The asymptotic form for a metric which is projectively compact of order two derived in Theorem 7 is a special case of an asymptotic form (depending on α) introduced in Section 2.4 of [6]. There we have proved that such an asymptotic form for g implies projective compactness of order α for any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ such that $\frac{2}{\alpha}$ is an integer. We next specialize the results on the boundary conformal structure and on curvature asymptotics to metrics admitting such an asymptotic form.

The assumptions for this asymptotic form is that locally around each boundary point, we find a defining function ρ and a nowhere vanishing smooth function C with additional properties specified below, such that the $\binom{0}{2}$ -tensor field

$$(8) \quad h := \rho^{2/\alpha} g - C \frac{d\rho^2}{\rho^{2/\alpha}}$$

admits a smooth extension to the boundary, with the boundary value being non-degenerate on $T\partial M$. The additional property required from C is that for each vector field ζ which is smooth up to the boundary and satisfies $d\rho(\zeta) = 0$, the

function $\rho^{-2/\alpha}\zeta \cdot C$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Theorem 2.6 of [6] then states that under these assumptions (including $2/\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$), the Levi–Civita connection of g is projectively compact of order α . For $\alpha = 2$, Theorem 7 shows that we always get the asymptotic form with a constant C , so we will pay special attention to this case.

Proposition 10. *Suppose that we are in the setting of Theorem 2.6 of [6], i.e. $\frac{2}{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the tensor field h defined in (8) is smooth up to the boundary with the boundary value being non-degenerate on $T\partial M$.*

(i) *If $\alpha < 2$, then the projective second fundamental form for ∂M vanishes identically, so ∂M is totally geodesic.*

(ii) *If $\alpha = 2$, then the restriction of h to boundary directions is a representative of the projective second fundamental form for ∂M . Furthermore, if C is constant then the boundary value of h coincides with $-2C\hat{\nabla}d\rho$, where $\hat{\nabla} = \nabla + \frac{d\rho}{2\rho}$ is the projective modification, associated to ρ , of the Levi–Civita connection ∇ of g .*

Proof. We use ideas from the proof of Theorem 2.6 of [6] and also the notation introduced there. In the proof of that theorem, one first constructs a vector field ζ_0 such that $d\rho(\zeta_0) \equiv 1$ and ζ_0 is orthogonal with respect to h to all vector fields in the kernel of $d\rho$. In particular, as observed there, for any tangent vector fields ξ, η one can compute the boundary value of $-d\rho(\hat{\nabla}_\xi\eta)$ as the boundary value of $\frac{-1}{C}\rho^{4/\alpha}g(\hat{\nabla}_\xi\eta, \zeta_0)$.

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2.6 of [6] is the modified Koszul formula, which says that $2g(\hat{\nabla}_\xi\eta, \zeta_0)$ can be computed as

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \xi \cdot g(\eta, \zeta_0) - \zeta_0 \cdot g(\xi, \eta) + \eta \cdot g(\xi, \zeta_0) + g([\xi, \eta], \zeta_0) - g([\xi, \zeta_0], \eta) \\ & - g([\eta, \zeta_0], \xi) + \frac{2d\rho(\xi)}{\alpha\rho}g(\eta, \zeta_0) + \frac{2d\rho(\eta)}{\alpha\rho}g(\xi, \zeta_0). \end{aligned}$$

Let us first assume that $d\rho(\xi) = d\rho(\eta) = 0$. Then we get $d\rho([\xi, \eta]) = -dd\rho(\xi, \eta) = 0$, so $g(\xi, \zeta_0)$, $g(\eta, \zeta_0)$ and $g([\xi, \eta], \zeta_0)$ vanish identically. Next, $g([\xi, \zeta_0], \eta) = \frac{1}{\rho^{2/\alpha}}h([\xi, \zeta_0], \eta)$, so after multiplication by $\rho^{4/\alpha}$ this extends smoothly to the boundary by zero, and the same holds for the corresponding term with ξ and η exchanged. In conclusion, we see that we can compute the boundary value of $-d\rho(\hat{\nabla}_\xi\eta)$ as the boundary value of

$$\frac{1}{2C}\rho^{4/\alpha}\zeta_0 \cdot g(\xi, \eta) = \frac{1}{2C}\rho^{4/\alpha}\zeta_0 \cdot \frac{1}{\rho^{2/\alpha}}h(\xi, \eta).$$

Up to terms vanishing along the boundary, this equals $\frac{-1}{\alpha C}\rho^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}h(\xi, \eta)$. But since $d\rho(\eta) = 0$, we get $-d\rho(\hat{\nabla}_\xi\eta) = (\hat{\nabla}_\xi d\rho)(\eta)$, so we get (i) and the first part of (ii).

To obtain the second statement in (ii) we have to analyze (in the case $\alpha = 2$ and for C being constant) the modified Koszul formula (9) for general vector fields ξ and η , which needs much more care. From the proof of Theorem 2.6 in [6] we see that (always taking into account that $\alpha = 2$)

$$\begin{aligned} g(\eta, \zeta_0) &= d\rho(\eta)\left(\frac{C}{\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho}h(\zeta_0, \zeta_0)\right) \\ g(\xi, \eta) &= \frac{C}{\rho^2}d\rho(\xi)d\rho(\eta) + \frac{1}{\rho}h(\xi, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Now if we plug the appropriate versions of these into the modified Koszul formula (9) and carry out the differentiations, we can sort the terms according to powers of ρ . In the proof of Theorem 2.6 of [6] it is shown that the terms containing $\frac{1}{\rho^3}$ add up to zero. We have to determine the terms containing $\frac{1}{\rho^2}$ while we may ignore terms containing $\frac{1}{\rho}$ or no negative power of ρ . The first and third term in (9) together contribute

$$(10) \quad C\xi \cdot d\rho(\eta) + C\eta \cdot d\rho(\xi) - 2d\rho(\xi)d\rho(\eta)h(\zeta_0, \zeta_0)$$

to the coefficient of $\frac{1}{\rho^2}$. Now the last part of this cancels with the contribution of the last two summands in (9). On the other hand, the only contribution of the fourth summand in (9) to the coefficient of $\frac{1}{\rho^2}$ is $Cd\rho([\xi, \eta])$. Expanding $0 = dd\rho(\xi, \eta)$ we see that this adds up with the second term in (10) to $C\xi \cdot d\rho(\eta)$, so the overall contribution of all terms we have considered so far is $2C\xi \cdot d\rho(\eta)$.

Next, the contribution of the second summand of (9) to the coefficient of $\frac{1}{\rho^2}$ is given by

$$h(\xi, \eta) - C\zeta_0 \cdot (d\rho(\xi)d\rho(\eta)),$$

while the fifth and sixth summands contribute

$$-Cd\rho([\xi, \zeta_0])d\rho(\eta) - Cd\rho([\eta, \zeta_0])d\rho(\xi).$$

But since $d\rho(\zeta_0) \equiv 1$, the fact that $0 = dd\rho(\xi, \zeta_0)$ implies that $\zeta_0 \cdot d\rho(\xi) = d\rho([\xi, \zeta_0])$ and likewise for η , so these terms together only contribute $h(\xi, \eta)$.

Collecting the results, we see that the boundary value of $-d\rho(\hat{\nabla}_\xi \eta)$ can be computed as the boundary value of $\frac{-1}{2C}(2C\xi \cdot d\rho(\eta) + h(\xi, \eta))$. Bringing the first term to the other side, we obtain the boundary value of $(\hat{\nabla}d\rho)(\xi, \eta)$ which implies the result. $\square$

Next, we describe the curvature for pseudo-Riemannian metrics which are projectively compact of order two and show that they satisfy an asymptotic version of the Einstein equation.

Theorem 11. *Let $g = g_{ab}$ be a pseudo-Riemannian metric on M , with inverse g^{ab} , which is projectively compact of order two and let $h = h_{ab}$ and C be as in Theorem 7. Let $R_{ab}{}^c{}_d$ be the Riemann curvature of g , $R_{ab} = R_{da}{}^d{}_b$ its Ricci curvature and $S = g^{ab}R_{ab}$ its scalar curvature.*

(i) *The trace-free part $R_{ab} - \frac{S}{n+1}g_{ab}$ of the Ricci tensor admits a smooth extension to the boundary.*

(ii) *Up to terms which admit a smooth extension to the boundary, the curvature of g_{ab} is given by*

$$R_{ab}{}^c{}_d = -\frac{1}{2\rho^2}\delta_{[a}^c\rho_{b]}\rho_d - \frac{1}{2C\rho}\delta_{[a}^c h_{b]d}.$$

Proof. (i) By Proposition 8 and formula (7) from its proof, $\rho P_{ab} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_a\rho_b$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary with boundary value $\frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$. On the other hand, Proposition 3 shows that $\rho\frac{1}{n+1}g^{ij}P_{ij}g_{ab} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_a\rho_b$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary. The boundary value of this coincides with the one of $\frac{1}{n+1}g^{ij}P_{ij}h_{ab}$ and hence with the one of $-\frac{1}{4C}h_{ab}$. By Proposition 10, the latter boundary value

also equals $\frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$. Forming the difference, we conclude that $\rho(\mathbf{P}_{ab} - \frac{1}{n+1}g^{ij}\mathbf{P}_{ij}g_{ab})$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary with boundary value zero, so the tracefree part of $\mathbf{P}_{ij}$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Now in dimension $n+1$, we have $R_{ab} = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{P}_{ab}$, which implies the result.

(ii) We use the formula for the curvature from the proof of Proposition 9, taking into account that $\beta_{ab} = 0$. Since we know from above, that $\mathbf{P}_{ab} + \frac{1}{4C}g_{ab}$ admits a smooth extension to the boundary, we may replace $\mathbf{P}_{ab}$ by $-\frac{1}{4C}g_{ab}$, and then the claim follows from inserting the asymptotic form

$$g_{ab} = \frac{1}{\rho}h_{ab} + \frac{C}{\rho^2}\rho_a\rho_b.$$

for g . □

4. BOUNDARY TRACTORS

For the last part of this article, we assume that we have given a special affine connection on M which is projectively compact of order two and has the property that the projective second fundamental form is non-degenerate (in directions tangent to the boundary) at each boundary point. (Observe that by Theorem 7 and Proposition 10, this condition is always satisfied in the case of a pseudo-Riemannian metric which is projectively compact of order two.) In this case, as shown in Section 3.1, a well-defined conformal geometry is induced on the boundary ∂M . As for any conformal geometry, its structure is naturally captured and conceptually described by its associated conformal tractor bundle and connection.

In this section we give a description of these conformal boundary tractors in terms of the projective structure in the interior. We derive formulae for the ingredients used in this description both in terms of asymptotics of data associated to the projectively compact connection in the interior and in terms of data which are manifestly smooth up to the boundary. In contrast to the usual presentation of conformal tractors, our description is entirely based on connections from the projective class, we do not choose a connection on the boundary which is compatible with the conformal structure.

4.1. The tractor bundle and its metric. In spite of the rather complicated relation between a projectively compact connection on M and the induced conformal structure on ∂M , we show that the tractor bundles associated to these structures are easily and elegantly related. As we have observed in Section 2.1, a special affine connection ∇ on M , which is projectively compact of order two, determines a defining density $\tau \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}(2))$ for ∂M (up to a non-zero constant factor). The main property of τ is that, over M , it is parallel for ∇ . Via the BGG splitting operator, we obtain a section $L(\tau)$ of the tractor bundle $S^2\mathcal{T}^*$ over $\overline{M}$.

The motivation for the developments in this section comes from the special case of Levi-Civita connections of non-Ricci-flat Einstein metrics. In this case, the section $L(\tau)$ of $S^2\mathcal{T}^*$ is parallel for the tractor connection, thus defining a reduction of projective holonomy to a pseudo-orthogonal group. Via the general theory of holonomy reductions developed in [9], one obtains an induced conformal

structure on the boundary, which by Proposition 10 coincides with the one discussed in this article. The general theory further implies that one can obtain the conformal standard tractor bundle by restricting the projective standard tractor bundle to the boundary, endowing it with the bundle metric $L(\tau)$. Furthermore the restriction of the projective standard tractor connection to this bundle is the conformal standard tractor connection, see Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of [9].

Surprisingly, the first part of this works in far greater generality, as follows.

Proposition 12. *Let $\overline{M} = M \cup \partial M$ be a smooth manifold with boundary, and suppose that ∇ is a linear connection on TM which is projectively compact of order two and such that the projective second fundamental form on ∂M is non-degenerate.*

Then endowing the restriction $\mathcal{T}|_{\partial M}$ of the projective standard tractor bundle with the line subbundle $\mathcal{T}^1|_{\partial M}$ and the bundle metric $L(\tau)|_{\partial M}$, one obtains a standard tractor bundle for the induced conformal structure on ∂M .

Explicitly, this means that $\mathcal{T}^1|_{\partial M}$ is isomorphic to the conformal density bundle $\mathcal{E}[-1]$ and isotropic for $L(\tau)|_{\partial M}$, the quotient $(\mathcal{T}^1)^\perp/\mathcal{T}^1$ is isomorphic to $T\partial M \otimes \mathcal{E}[-1]$ and the metric on this quotient induced by $L(\tau)$ coincides with the conformal metric defined by the projective second fundamental form.

Proof. In Section 3.3 of [6] it is shown that in the splitting of $S^2\mathcal{T}^*$ determined by ∇ (which is only defined over M) we have

$$(11) \quad L(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ 0 \\ \mathbf{P}_{ab}\tau \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here we use that the Schouten tensor of a special affine connection is symmetric. Now we can easily analyze the boundary behavior $L(\tau)$ analogously to the proof of Proposition 3. Consider a local defining function ρ for ∂M and let $\hat{\nabla} = {}^\rho\nabla$ be the corresponding projectively rescaled connection which admits a smooth extension to the boundary. Similar to arguments in the proof of Proposition 3, we see that in the splitting determined by $\hat{\nabla}$, we get

$$(12) \quad L(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho\hat{\tau} \\ \frac{1}{2}\rho_a\hat{\tau} \\ \mathbf{P}_{ab}\rho\hat{\tau} + \frac{\rho_a\rho_b}{4\rho}\hat{\tau} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Along the boundary, the top slot vanishes, while the middle slot is evidently nowhere vanishing with pointwise kernel isomorphic to $T\partial M \subset T\overline{M}|_{\partial M}$. Finally, by formula (7) from the proof of Proposition 8, the boundary value of the bottom slot is $\frac{1}{2}\hat{\tau}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$, so the restriction of this bilinear form to boundary directions is non-degenerate by the assumptions.

Together, this shows that $L(\tau)|_{\partial M}$ defines a non-degenerate bundle metric on the restriction $\mathcal{T}|_{\partial M}$ and that $\mathcal{T}^1 \subset \mathcal{T}$ is isotropic for this bundle metric along the boundary. Moreover, the form of the middle slot of $L(\tau)$ in (12) implies that the quotient $(\mathcal{T}^1)^\perp/\mathcal{T}^1$ can be identified with $T\partial M(-1) \subset T\overline{M}(-1)|_{\partial M}$.

Finally, recall that there is the canonical conormal bundle $\mathcal{N} \subset T^*\overline{M}|_{\partial M}$, which is defined as the annihilator of $T\partial M$. Now for the top exterior powers, we get

$(\Lambda^{n+1}T^*\overline{M})|_{\partial M} \cong \mathcal{N} \otimes (\Lambda^n T^* \partial M)$. In terms of the usual conventions for projective and conformal density bundles (see [2]) this reads as $\mathcal{E}(-n-2)|_{\partial M} \cong \mathcal{N} \otimes \mathcal{E}[-n]$. Now since the top slot of $L(\tau)$ vanishes along ∂M , its middle slot $\hat{\tau}\rho_a$ is actually independent of all choices, thus defining a nowhere vanishing section of $\mathcal{N}(2) \cong \mathcal{E}(-n)|_{\partial M} \otimes \mathcal{E}[n]$. In particular, this induces a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{E}(n)|_{\partial M} \cong \mathcal{E}[n]$ and hence also an identification $\mathcal{E}(-1)|_{\partial M} \cong \mathcal{E}[-1]$.

This shows that we obtain the claimed composition series for $\mathcal{T}|_{\partial M}$. Since the bundle metric on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^\perp/\mathcal{T}^1$ induced by $L(\tau)$ clearly comes from the restriction of $\frac{1}{2}\hat{\tau}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b$ to tangential directions, we also get the correct conformal metric on the quotient. $\square$

4.2. The asymptotically parallel case. Without further assumptions, one can certainly not follow the developments in the Einstein case discussed in 4.1 directly, since the projective standard tractor connection is not compatible with the bundle metric $L(\tau)$. Indeed, the covariant derivative of $L(\tau)$ with respect to the normal tractor connection on $S^2\mathcal{T}^*$ can be computed explicitly, see Section 3.3 of [6]. There it is shown that, in the splitting on M determined by the projectively compact connection ∇ , this derivative is given by putting $\tau\nabla_a P_{bc}$ into the bottom slot of the tractor, while the other two slots are identical zero. Since the bottom slot is the injecting slot, it has the same form in any other splitting, so in particular, this section has to admit a smooth extension to the boundary. We next give a direct proof for the fact that $\tau\nabla_a P_{bc}$ admits a smooth extension. We also derive a formula for this tensor in terms of objects which are manifestly smooth up to the boundary as well as an alternative description, which is valid for Levi-Civita connections.

Proposition 13. *Let ∇ be a special affine connection on M , which is projectively compact of order 2 and induces a non-degenerate boundary geometry on ∂M and let P_{ab} be its Schouten tensor. Let ρ be a local defining function for the boundary and let $\hat{\nabla} = \nabla + \frac{d\rho}{2\rho}$ be the corresponding connection in the projective class. Then we have*

(i) $\rho\nabla_a P_{bc} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}_a\hat{\nabla}_b\rho_c + \rho_a\hat{P}_{bc} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_b\hat{P}_{ac} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_c\hat{P}_{ab} + \rho\hat{\nabla}_a\hat{P}_{bc}$, and the right hand side provides a smooth extension of the left hand side to the boundary.

(ii) If ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of a pseudo-Riemannian metric g_{ab} , and S is its scalar curvature, then for $\Phi_{ab} := P_{ab} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)}Sg_{ab}$, we get

$$\rho\nabla_a P_{bc} = \rho_a\Phi_{bc} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_b\Phi_{ac} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_c\Phi_{ba} + \rho\left(\hat{\nabla}_a\Phi_{bc} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)}g_{bc}\hat{\nabla}_a S\right).$$

All terms in the right hand side admit smooth extensions to the boundary and the last summand does not contribute to the boundary value.

Proof. (i) For $\alpha = 2$, equation (7) from the proof of Proposition 8 reads as

$$(13) \quad \rho P_{bc} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_b\rho_c = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}_b\rho_c + \rho\hat{P}_{bc}.$$

Applying $\hat{\nabla}_a$ to this equation, the second term on the left hand side gives

$$(14) \quad \frac{-1}{4\rho^2}\rho_a\rho_b\rho_c + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_b\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_c + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_c\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b.$$

Now we can combine half of the first summand in this expression with the second summand to obtain

$$\frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_b(\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_c - \frac{1}{2\rho}\rho_a\rho_c).$$

From (13) we see that we can replace the bracket by $2\rho(\mathbf{P}_{ac} - \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{ac})$ and thus obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho_b\mathbf{P}_{ac} - \frac{1}{2}\rho_b\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{ac}.$$

Likewise the second half of the first term in (14) adds up with the last term in this formula to the same expression with b and c exchanged.

To compute $\hat{\nabla}_a$ of the first term in the left hand side of (13) we use the standard formulae for the action of projectively related connections on tensor fields to obtain

$$\hat{\nabla}_a\mathbf{P}_{bc} = \nabla_a\mathbf{P}_{bc} - 2\Upsilon_a\mathbf{P}_{bc} - \Upsilon_b\mathbf{P}_{ac} - \Upsilon_c\mathbf{P}_{ba}.$$

Here Υ describes the change from ∇ to $\hat{\nabla}$, i.e. $\Upsilon_a = \frac{\rho_a}{2\rho}$. We have to multiply all that by ρ and add $\rho_a\mathbf{P}_{bc}$ to obtain the contribution of the first term on the left hand side. Hence we conclude that applying $\hat{\nabla}_a$ to the left hand side of (13) we obtain

$$\rho\nabla_a\mathbf{P}_{bc} - \frac{1}{2}\rho_b\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{ac} - \frac{1}{2}\rho_c\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{ab}.$$

Applying $\hat{\nabla}_a$ to the right hand side of (13) directly leads to the claimed formula.

(ii) Observe first that Φ_{ab} admits a smooth extension to the boundary by Theorem 11. Since S admits a smooth extension to the boundary by Proposition 1, the last statement is evident. On M , we obtain

$$\hat{\nabla}_a\Phi_{bc} = \nabla_a\Phi_{bc} - 2\Upsilon_a\Phi_{bc} - \Upsilon_b\Phi_{ac} - \Upsilon_c\Phi_{ba},$$

as in the proof of part (i) with $\Upsilon_a = \frac{\rho_a}{2\rho}$. Now $\nabla_a\Phi_{bc} = \nabla_a\mathbf{P}_{bc} - \frac{1}{n(n+1)}g_{bc}\nabla_a S$, and since S is a function, can replace ∇_a by $\hat{\nabla}_a$ in the last term. From this the claimed formula follows immediately by multiplying by ρ and rearranging terms. $\square$

As mentioned in 4.1, in the case of the Levi-Civita connection of an Einstein metric, the bundle metric $L(\tau)$ is parallel over all of $\overline{M}$, and one obtains the conformal standard tractor connection on the boundary as a restriction of the projective standard tractor connection. The argument which was used to prove this in Proposition 3.2 of [9] actually can be applied in a significantly more general situation, as we will show next.

Surprisingly, it suffices to assume that $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*}L(\tau)$ vanishes along the boundary (although this is not enough to ensure compatibility of the tractor curvature with $L(\tau)$ along the boundary). Since $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*}L(\tau)$ amounts to $\tau\nabla_a\mathbf{P}_{bc}$, in the sense described above, and by Proposition 13 (for example) this has a smooth extension to the boundary, it follows that $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*}L(\tau)$ vanishes on ∂M if and only if $\nabla_a\mathbf{P}_{bc}$ admits a smooth extension to all of $\overline{M}$. Moreover, from Proposition 13 we see that, for a pseudo-Riemannian metric g_{ab} which is projectively compact of order two, vanishing of $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*}L(\tau)$ along ∂M is equivalent to the boundary value of $R_{ab} - \frac{S}{n+1}g_{ab}$ vanishing identically. The last condition is a (by one order) stronger asymptotic form of the Einstein equation than the one that g_{ab} satisfies by Theorem 11.

Theorem 14. *Let $\overline{M} = M \cup \partial M$ be a smooth manifold of dimension $n+1 \geq 4$ with boundary and suppose that ∇ is a linear connection on TM which is projectively compact of order two and such that the projective second fundamental form on ∂M is non-degenerate. Assume further that the canonical defining density $\tau \in \Gamma(\mathcal{E}(2))$ for ∂M determined by ∇ has the property that $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau)|_{\partial M} = 0$.*

Then one can restrict the projective standard tractor connection to the conformal standard tractor bundle on ∂M , as constructed in Proposition 12, and the result is the canonical normal conformal tractor connection.

Proof. It is no problem to restrict the tractor connection on $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \overline{M}$ to a linear connection on $\mathcal{T}|_{\partial M} \rightarrow \partial M$. Since we have assumed that $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau)|_{\partial M} = 0$, this produces a tractor connection, which is compatible with the bundle metric $L(\tau)|_{\partial M}$. To complete the proof, it remains to verify that the curvature of this tractor connection satisfies the normalization condition imposed on a conformal standard tractor connection.

This normalization condition is best described in two steps. The first requirement on the curvature is that it maps the distinguished subbundle $\mathcal{T}^1|_{\partial M}$ to itself. Skew symmetry of the curvature then implies that it also preserves the orthocomplement of this subbundle, so there is an induced endomorphism on the quotient space, which is isomorphic to $T\partial M \otimes \mathcal{E}(-1)$. One can view the result as a section of $\Lambda^2 T^* \partial M \otimes \text{End}(T\partial M)$, and the second part of the normalization condition is that the Ricci-type contraction of this tensor field vanishes.

Now the curvature of the restricted connection is just the restriction of the curvature of the projective standard tractor connection. This means that one only inserts vectors tangent to the boundary into the two-form part of the curvature, but the endomorphism part still acts on the full bundle. It is well known (see [2]) that the curvature of the projective standard tractor connection satisfies similar normalization conditions. In particular, this curvature vanishes identically on the distinguished subbundle $\mathcal{T}^1$. Similarly as above, this implies that the values of the curvature descend to endomorphisms of the quotient $\mathcal{T}/\mathcal{T}^1 \cong T\overline{M}(-1)$. So one obtains a section of $\Lambda^2 T^* \overline{M} \otimes \text{End}(T\overline{M})$ and the Ricci-type contraction of this vanishes (and the tensor itself coincides with the projective Weyl curvature of any connection in the projective class).

Now the fact that the subbundle $\mathcal{T}^1$ is annihilated of course carries over to the restriction, so the first part of the conformal normalization condition is satisfied. Now suppose that we can further show that values of the endomorphisms obtained from the projective Weyl curvature along the boundary always lie in $T\partial M \subset T\overline{M}|_{\partial M}$. Then using a basis of $T_x \overline{M}$ consisting of a basis of $T_x \partial M$ for $x \in \partial M$ and one transversal vector, one immediately concludes that the Ricci type contraction of the projective Weyl curvature coincides with the Ricci-type contraction over the subspaces $T\partial M$, so that latter vanishes. Hence we can complete the proof by verifying this property of the projective Weyl curvature. This can be done by taking a locally non-vanishing section σ of $\mathcal{T}^1$ and proving that, denoting by κ the curvature of the projective tractor connection $\nabla^{\mathcal{T}}$, we get

$$L(\tau)(\kappa(\xi, \eta)(t), \sigma)|_{\partial M} = 0$$

for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{X}(\overline{M})$ and any section $t \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$. (We could actually assume in addition that ξ is tangent to ∂M and that $L(\tau)(t, \sigma) = 0$, but these assumptions are not needed.) Note that this would follow immediately if we were to assume that the one-jet of $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau)$ vanishes along ∂M , since this implies skew symmetry of $\kappa(\xi, \eta)$ with respect to $L(\tau)$ along the boundary.

Under the weaker assumptions we have made, we have to supply a direct argument which uses the additional information on $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau)$ we have available. We start with the defining equation

$$(\nabla_\xi^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau))(t_1, t_2) = \xi \cdot (L(\tau)(t_1, t_2)) - L(\tau)(\nabla_\xi^\mathcal{T} t_1, t_2) - L(\tau)(t_1, \nabla_\xi^\mathcal{T} t_2)$$

for $t_1, t_2 \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$. Using this, one directly computes that

$$\begin{aligned} L(\tau)(\nabla_\xi^\mathcal{T} \nabla_\eta^\mathcal{T} t_1, t_2) - L(\tau)(t_1, \nabla_\eta^\mathcal{T} \nabla_\xi^\mathcal{T} t_2) \\ = \xi \cdot (L(\tau)(\nabla_\eta^\mathcal{T} t_1, t_2)) - (\nabla_\xi^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau))(\nabla_\eta^\mathcal{T} t_1, t_2) \\ - \eta \cdot (L(\tau)(t_1, \nabla_\xi^\mathcal{T} t_2)) + (\nabla_\eta^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau))(t_1, \nabla_\xi^\mathcal{T} t_2). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the terms involving a covariant derivative of $L(\tau)$ by assumption vanish along the boundary, so we can drop them for the further considerations. Subtracting the same term with ξ and η exchanged, for the right hand side we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \cdot (L(\tau)(\nabla_\eta^\mathcal{T} t_1, t_2) + L(\tau)(t_1, \nabla_\eta^\mathcal{T} t_2)) \\ = \xi \cdot \eta \cdot (L(\tau)(t_1, t_2)) - \xi \cdot \left(\nabla_\eta^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau)(t_1, t_2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

minus the same expression with ξ and η exchanged. Now the second term in the right hand side here does not vanish along the boundary in general. However, we only have to consider this in the case that $t_2 = \sigma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^1)$. But the fact that $\nabla^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau)$ is concentrated in the bottom slot (over all of $\overline{M}$) which we have noted in the beginning of Section 4.2 exactly means that any covariant derivative of $L(\tau)$ vanishes identically provided that one of its entries is from the subbundle $\mathcal{T}^1$. So the only potential contribution to the boundary value coming from these two terms is

$$(15) \quad \xi \cdot \eta \cdot (L(\tau)(t_1, t_2)) - \eta \cdot \xi \cdot (L(\tau)(t_1, t_2)).$$

To arrive at

$$L(\tau)(\kappa(\xi, \eta)(t_1), t_2) + L(\tau)(t_1, \kappa(\xi, \eta)(t_2)),$$

we further have to subtract

$$\begin{aligned} L(\tau)(\nabla_{[\xi, \eta]}^\mathcal{T} t_1, t_2) + L(\tau)(t_1, \nabla_{[\xi, \eta]}^\mathcal{T} t_2) \\ = [\xi, \eta] \cdot (L(\tau)(t_1, t_2)) - (\nabla_{[\xi, \eta]}^{S^2\mathcal{T}^*} L(\tau))(t_1, t_2). \end{aligned}$$

Now the first term on the right hand side cancels with (15), while the second one vanishes along the boundary by assumption. Now the claim follows since $\kappa(\xi, \eta)$ vanishes on the subbundle $\mathcal{T}^1$. $\square$

4.3. The inverse of the tractor metric. Before we can proceed towards the description of the normal tractor connection on the boundary in the case that $L(\tau)$ is not parallel along the boundary, we have to derive some further properties of the Schouten-tensor P_{ab} of ∇ . In Proposition 12 we have seen that non-degeneracy of the boundary geometry implies that the bundle metric $L(\tau)$ is non-degenerate on ∂M . By continuity, it is non-degenerate on some open neighborhood of the boundary and we will from now on restrict to this neighborhood, i.e. assume that $L(\tau)$ is non-degenerate on all of $\overline{M}$. On M we can return to the scale determined by τ , and there, in view of (11), non-degeneracy of $L(\tau)$ is equivalent to non-degeneracy of the Schouten-tensor P_{ab} . This means that we can use P_{ab} as a Riemannian metric on M , but of course, the Levi-Civita connection of this metric is not in the projective class in general.

By non-degeneracy, we can also form the inverse P^{ab} of P_{ab} as a bilinear form. We can derive asymptotic properties of P^{ab} using the inverse $L(\tau)^{-1}$ of the tractor metric, which is a smooth section of $S^2\mathcal{T}$ over all of $\overline{M}$.

Proposition 15. *Let ∇ be a special affine connection on M , which is projectively compact of order 2 and induces a non-degenerate boundary geometry on ∂M . Let ρ be a local defining function for the boundary and let $\hat{\nabla} = \nabla + \frac{d\rho}{2\rho}$ be the corresponding connection in the projective class. Then in the splitting of $S^2\mathcal{T}$ defined by the connection $\hat{\nabla}$, the inverse $L(\tau)^{-1}$ of the tractor metric is given by*

$$(16) \quad L(\tau)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}^{-1}\rho^{-1}P^{ab} \\ 2\hat{\tau}^{-1}t^a \\ \hat{\tau}^{-1}\psi \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\tau = \rho\hat{\tau}$, $t^a = -\frac{1}{4\rho^2}P^{ab}\rho_b$, and ψ is a function which is smooth up to the boundary. Moreover, we obtain

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} t^a\rho_a &= 1 - \rho\psi & t^a(\rho P_{ab} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_a\rho_b) &= -\frac{1}{4}\psi\rho_b \\ \rho^{-1}P^{ac}(\rho P_{cb} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_c\rho_b) + t^a\rho_b &= \delta_b^a \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the tensor fields $\rho^{-1}P^{ab}$ and $\rho^{-2}P^{ab}\rho_b$ on M admit smooth extensions to all of $\overline{M}$.

Proof. Over M , and in the splitting determined by ∇ , we clearly have

$$(18) \quad L(\tau)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau^{-1}P^{ab} \\ 0 \\ \tau^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The top slot of this is independent of the choice of splitting, so we see that we can use (16) to define t^a and ψ . But then we can use formula (12) for $L(\tau)$ in the splitting determined by $\hat{\nabla}$ to compute the consequences of $L(\tau)$ and $L(\tau)^{-1}$ being inverses of each other. This is most easily done by interpreting $L(\tau)$ as a map $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^*$ and $L(\tau)^{-1}$ as a map $\mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. By (12) in the splitting determined

by $\hat{\nabla}$, we have

$$L(\tau) \left(\begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^a \\ \sigma_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_2^b \\ \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \hat{\tau} \left(\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2 + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_1\rho_a\nu_2^a + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_2\rho_a\nu_1^a + (\rho\mathbf{P}_{ab} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_a\rho_b)\nu_1^a\nu_2^b \right).$$

Hence the associated map is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu^a \\ \sigma \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}(\rho\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\rho_a\nu^a) \\ \hat{\tau}(\frac{1}{2}\sigma\rho_a + (\rho\mathbf{P}_{ab} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_a\rho_b)\nu^b) \end{pmatrix}$$

In the same way, one verifies that (16) corresponds to the map $\mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \mu_a \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}^{-1}(\rho^{-1}\mathbf{P}^{ab}\mu_b + 2\beta t^a) \\ \hat{\tau}^{-1}(2t^a\mu_a + \psi\beta) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The fact that the composition of this with the above is the identity immediately leads to the claimed formula for t^a as well as to (17). The last claim then follows since all slots in (16) must admit smooth extensions to the boundary. $\square$

4.4. The metric tractor connection. Now we can proceed, in the general setting, toward a description of the normal tractor connection on the conformal standard tractor bundle obtained in Proposition 12. We will do this in two steps, the first of which can be done on all of $\overline{M}$ (assuming that $L(\tau)$ is non-degenerate on all of $\overline{M}$). In this first step, we modify the projective standard tractor connection on $\mathcal{T}$ to a connection which is compatible with the bundle metric $L(\tau)$ and torsion free (in the sense of tractor connections). In the second step, we have to restrict to the boundary, where we can then normalize this metric tractor connection to obtain the conformal standard tractor connection.

A modification of the standard tractor connection $\nabla^{\mathcal{T}}$ is determined by a contorsion, which is an element of $\Omega^1(\overline{M}, \text{End}(\mathcal{T}))$. Choosing a connection in the projective class, one obtains an isomorphism $\mathcal{T} \cong \mathcal{E}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{E}^a(-1)$ and correspondingly we get an isomorphism $\text{End}(\mathcal{T}) \cong \mathcal{E}_b \oplus (\mathcal{E}_b^a \oplus \mathcal{E}(0)) \oplus \mathcal{E}^a$. We write this in a matrix form, with the action given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} A^a_b & \xi^a \\ \psi_b & \lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu^b \\ \sigma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^a_b\nu^b + \sigma\xi^a \\ \lambda\sigma + \psi_b\nu^b \end{pmatrix}.$$

From this definition and the change of splitting on standard tractors as described in [2], one readily concludes that a change of connection described by a one-form Υ_a changes this splitting as

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\xi}^a &= \xi^a & \hat{A}^a_b &= A^a_b + \xi^a\Upsilon_b & \hat{\lambda} &= \lambda - \Upsilon_c\varphi^c \\ \hat{\psi}_b &= \psi_b - A^c_b\Upsilon_c + \lambda\Upsilon_b - \Upsilon_c\xi^c\Upsilon_b. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we can denote one-forms with values in $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ by simply adding an additional lower index to each slot. It is also straightforward to describe the linear connection on $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ induced by the standard tractor connection. In terms of any connection $\tilde{\nabla}_a$ in a projective class with Schouten-tensor $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{ab}$ the standard

tractor connection is, in the splitting determined by $\tilde{\nabla}_a$, given by

$$(20) \quad \nabla_a^{\mathcal{T}} \begin{pmatrix} \nu^b \\ \sigma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\nabla}_a \nu^b + \sigma \delta_a^b \\ \tilde{\nabla}_a \sigma - \tilde{P}_{ab} \nu^b \end{pmatrix},$$

see [2]. From this, one deduces by a straightforward computation that the induced linear connection on $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ is, in that splitting, given by

$$(21) \quad \nabla_a^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})} \begin{pmatrix} A^b{}_c & \xi^b \\ \psi_c & \lambda \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\nabla}_a A^b{}_c + \psi_c \delta_a^b + \tilde{P}_{ac} \xi^b & \tilde{\nabla}_a \xi^b + \lambda \delta_a^b - A^b{}_a \\ \tilde{\nabla}_a \psi_c - \tilde{P}_{ad} A^d{}_c - \lambda \tilde{P}_{ac} & \tilde{\nabla}_a \lambda - \tilde{P}_{ad} \xi^d - \psi_a \end{pmatrix}$$

Now we can compute the torsion free metric connection and its curvature.

Theorem 16. *Given ∇_a as before, consider the $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ -valued one-form Ψ , which on M is defined in the splitting corresponding to ∇_a as having all entries equal to zero, except for*

$$A_a{}^b{}_c := \frac{1}{2} P^{bd} (-\nabla_a P_{dc} - \nabla_c P_{da} + \nabla_d P_{ac}).$$

Then we have:

(i) Ψ admits a smooth extension to all of $\overline{M}$ and, defining a modification of the tractor connection as $\tilde{\nabla}_\xi^{\mathcal{T}} s := \nabla_\xi^{\mathcal{T}} s + \Psi(\xi)(s)$, the resulting connection is metric for $L(\tau)$.

(ii) Consider a local defining function ρ for ∂M , let $\hat{\nabla}_a$ be the corresponding connection in the projective class, $C_{ab}{}^c{}_d$ its projective Weyl curvature and Y_{abc} its projective Cotton tensor. Further, let t^a be the vector field from Proposition 15, and put

$$\psi_{ac} := t^d \rho (-\nabla_a P_{dc} - \nabla_c P_{da} + \nabla_d P_{ac}).$$

Then as a two-form with values in $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$, the curvature of $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is, in the splitting determined by $\hat{\nabla}$, given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_{ab}{}^c{}_d + 2\hat{\nabla}_{[a} A_{b]}{}^c{}_d - 2\psi_{d[a} \delta_{b]}^c + 2A_e{}^c{}_{[a} A_{b]}{}^e{}_d & 0 \\ Y_{abd} + 2\hat{\nabla}_{[a} \psi_{b]d} - 2\hat{P}_{e[a} A_{b]}{}^e{}_d + 2\psi_{e[a} A_{b]}{}^e{}_d & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

so in particular, $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is a torsion free tractor connection.

Proof. Take a local defining function ρ for ∂M and let $\hat{\nabla}$ be the corresponding connection in the projective class which is smooth up to the boundary. Then from (19) we see that writing Ψ over M in the splitting corresponding to $\hat{\nabla}$, there are two non-zero entries, namely $\hat{A}_a{}^b{}_c = A_a{}^b{}_c$ and $\hat{\psi}_{ac} = -A_a{}^d{}_c \Upsilon_d$, and we will omit the hats in the notation for A and ψ from now on. From Propositions 15 and 13, we know that $\rho^{-1} P^{ab}$ and $\rho \nabla_a P_{bc}$ admit smooth extensions to all of $\overline{M}$, whence the same is true for $A_a{}^b{}_c$. On the other hand $\Upsilon_a = \frac{\rho_a}{2\rho}$, so again by Proposition 15, ψ_{ac} admits a smooth extension to the boundary and has the claimed form.

Knowing that $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is well defined on all of $\overline{M}$, it suffices to prove that it is metric on the dense open subset M , where we can compute in the scale determined by ∇ . In that scale, formula (11) for $L(\tau)$ shows that

$$L(\tau) \left(\begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^a \\ \sigma_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_2^b \\ \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \tau \sigma_1 \sigma_2 + \tau P_{ab} \nu_1^a \nu_2^b.$$

On the other hand,

$$\tau P_{bc} A_a{}^b{}_d \nu_1^d \nu_2^c = \frac{1}{2} \tau \nu_1^d \nu_2^c (-\nabla_a P_{cd} - \nabla_d P_{ca} + \nabla_c P_{ad}),$$

and adding the same term with ν_1 and ν_2 exchanged, we arrive at $-\nu_1^d \nu_2^c \tau \nabla_a P_{cd}$. Using this, and formula (20) for the standard tractor connection it is easy to verify by a direct computation that $\tilde{\nabla}_a^\mathcal{T}$ is metric for $L(\tau)$.

For the description of the curvature, we use the description of Ψ in the splitting corresponding to $\hat{\nabla}$ from above. The curvature of the standard tractor connection is well known to be given in a splitting by the Weyl-curvature and the Cotton tensor, see [2]. On the other hand, it is also well known that the definition of $\tilde{\nabla}^\mathcal{T}$ implies that its curvature is related to the one of $\nabla^\mathcal{T}$ by

$$\tilde{R}(\xi, \eta) = R(\xi, \eta) + \nabla_\xi^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})}(\Psi(\eta)) - \nabla_\eta^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})}(\Psi(\xi)) - \Psi([\xi, \eta]) + [\Psi(\xi), \Psi(\eta)],$$

where in the last term we use the commutator of endomorphisms. The second to fourth term in the right hand side are the covariant exterior derivative of the $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ -valued one-form Ψ with respect to the connection induced by $\nabla^\mathcal{T}$. This can be computed by coupling $\nabla^\mathcal{T}$ to the (torsion free) connection $\hat{\nabla}$ on T^*M , differentiating the one-form Ψ with this coupled connection and then taking the alternation in the form-indices and multiplying by two. Using all that, the fact that both A and ψ are symmetric in the lower indices, and formula (21) for $\nabla^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})}$, the claimed formula for the curvature follows by a direction computation, and torsion freeness just means that the top right entry in the resulting matrix vanishes. $\square$

Observe that inserting the descriptions of $\rho \nabla_a P_{bc}$ from Proposition 13 into the formulae for $A_a{}^b{}_c$ and ψ_{ac} from the theorem, there are some cancellations. For example, in the case of a Levi-Civita connection, we obtain

$$A_a{}^b{}_c|_{\partial M} = -\frac{1}{2} \rho^{-1} P^{bd} (\rho_a \Phi_{dc} + \rho_c \Phi_{da})|_{\partial M},$$

where Φ_{ab} is the tensor from Proposition 13. A similar expression holds for ψ_{ac} .

4.5. Restricting to the boundary. Over M , the connection $\tilde{\nabla}^\mathcal{T}$ constructed in Theorem 4.4 is essentially uniquely determined by compatibility with the bundle metric $L(\tau)$ and torsion freeness. (This is closely related to the proof of existence and uniqueness of the Levi-Civita connection in the Cartan picture. Likewise, the proof of Theorem 4.4 is closely related to the construction of the Levi-Civita connection.) However, if we restrict to the boundary and differentiate only in boundary directions a further normalization is possible, and this will lead to a description of the conformal standard tractor connection. We do not provide complete formulae in general, but only describe how they can be obtained. The problem is that formulae are getting quite involved without simplifying assumptions (which is not surprising in view of the rather complicated relation between the geometries in the interior and on the boundary).

In what follows, we have to distinguish between directions tangent to the boundary and transversal directions, and we will adapt the abstract index notation accordingly. We use indices i, j, k , and so on to specify boundary directions, while

indices a, b, c , and so on will be used for directions which are not necessarily tangent to the boundary. A certain amount of care is needed here and also upper and lower indices have to be distinguished. For a lower index, it is no problem to replace a “general” index by a “tangential” one; this simply corresponds to restricting a linear functional to a hyperplane. On the other hand, there is no canonical extension of a functional defined on a hyperplane to the whole space, so “tangential” lower indices cannot be replaced by “general” ones without further choices. In contrast to this, for upper indices, a “tangential” index can always be considered as a general one (corresponding to the inclusion of a hyperplane into a vector space). One can recognize tangential upper indices by the fact that they have trivial contraction with ρ_a .

From now on, let us fix a local defining function ρ for the boundary and the corresponding connection $\hat{\nabla}_a$ in the projective class. Then consider the quantity $\gamma_{ab} := \rho P_{ab} + \frac{1}{4\rho}\rho_a\rho_b$ which occurs in (12). This admits a smooth extension to the boundary, and indeed by formula (13) from the proof of Proposition 13, we get $\gamma_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nabla}_a\rho_b + \rho\hat{P}_{ab}$. In particular, restricting to the boundary and tangential directions, we can form γ_{ij} , and this is a representative of the projective second fundamental form. On the other hand, consider the quantity $\rho^{-1}P^{ab}$ which shows up in (16). From the fact that the vector field t^a showing up in this proposition is smooth up to the boundary, we see that $\rho^{-1}P^{ab}\rho_b$ vanishes along ∂M . Hence the restriction of $\rho^{-1}P^{ab}$ to ∂M is actually tangential. Then the last equation in (17) shows that on tangential vectors, this restriction is actually inverse to γ_{ij} , so we denote it by γ^{ij} .

Next, we introduce a finer decomposition of $\mathcal{T}|_{\partial M}$, which resembles the usual picture of conformal standard tractors in slots. The necessary information is basically contained in Proposition 15. In particular, we can use the transversal t^a from there to identify $T\bar{M}(-1)$ along ∂M with $\mathcal{E}(1) \oplus T\partial M(-1)$ according to

$$(22) \quad \nu^a \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}\nu^b\rho_b \\ \nu^a - \nu^b\rho_b t^a \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \xi^i \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \xi^a + \hat{\tau}^{-1}\beta t^a.$$

These are inverse to each other since by the first formula in (17), we have $t^b\rho_b = 1$ along ∂M . Now we combine this with the splitting of $\mathcal{T}$ determined by $\hat{\nabla}_a$ to identify $\mathcal{T}$ along ∂M with $\mathcal{E}(1) \oplus T\partial M(-1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(-1)$, and we will use this splitting from now on. The second formula in (17) says that $t^a\gamma_{ab} = -\frac{1}{4}\psi\rho_b$. Combining this with the formula for $L(\tau)$ from the proof of Proposition 15, we get

$$(23) \quad L(\tau) \left(\begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \xi_1^i \\ \sigma_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_2 \\ \xi_2^i \\ \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \frac{1}{2}\beta_1\sigma_2 + \frac{1}{2}\beta_2\sigma_1 + \hat{\tau}\gamma_{ij}\xi_1^i\xi_2^j - \frac{1}{4}\psi\hat{\tau}^{-1}\beta_1\beta_2.$$

This is slightly different from the usual splitting of conformal standard tractors, since the line spanned by the first basis vector (corresponding to the $\mathcal{E}(1)$ -component) is not isotropic. One could correct this by passing to a line in $\mathcal{T}$ which is not contained in the subspace $\mathcal{E}^a(-1)$ (in the splitting determined by $\hat{\nabla}$), but we do not do this at this stage.

Theorem 17. *Consider the restriction of the linear connection $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ from Theorem 16 to the boundary (i.e. we differentiate in boundary directions only). Then the curvature of this restriction is given by restricting the two-form indices a and b in the formula for the curvature in Theorem 16 to tangential directions. Moreover, in our splitting, the curvature takes the form*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ V_{ij}^{\cdot k} & W_{ij}^{\cdot k}{}_{\ell} & 0 \\ 0 & -2\hat{\tau}V_{ij}^{\cdot k}\gamma_{k\ell} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $V_{ij}^{\cdot k} = V_{[ij]}^{\cdot k}$, $W_{ij}^{\cdot k}{}_{\ell} = W_{[ij]}^{\cdot k}{}_{\ell}$ and $W_{ij}^{\cdot r}{}_{\ell}\gamma_{kr} = -W_{ij}^{\cdot r}{}_{k}\gamma_{\ell r}$.

Suppose further that $n = \dim(\partial M) \geq 3$. Then putting

$$\varphi_{ij} := -\frac{1}{n-2}W_{ki}^{\cdot k}{}_{\cdot j} + \frac{1}{2(n-1)(n-2)}W_{kr}^{\cdot k}{}_{\cdot s}\gamma^{rs}\gamma_{ij}$$

and defining an $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ -valued one-form $\tilde{\Psi}$ on ∂M in our splitting by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\tau}^{-1}\varphi_{i\ell}\gamma^{k\ell} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varphi_{ij} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the linear connection ∇^0 defined by $\nabla_{\xi}^0 s = \tilde{\nabla}_{\xi}^{\mathcal{T}} s + \tilde{\Psi}(\xi)(s)$ is the normal conformal tractor connection on the conformal tractor bundle $\mathcal{T}|_{\partial M} \rightarrow \partial M$.

Proof. The facts that $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ can be restricted to the boundary and that the curvature is obtained by restriction follows as in the proof of Theorem 14. Writing the resulting curvature in a matrix according to our splitting, we see from the formula in Theorem 16 that the last column has to consist of zeros only. Moreover, since $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is metric for $L(\tau)$ all the values of its curvature are skew symmetric with respect to $L(\tau)$. Knowing that there are some zero blocks already, the claimed form of the curvature is established by a simple direct computation using formula (23).

For the second part of the proof, recall that for $n \geq 3$ it follows from the general theory (see [4] and [5]) that the canonical tractor connection on a conformal standard tractor bundle is characterized by the fact that it is metric and its curvature is normal. As described in the proof of Theorem 14, normality first requires that the curvature preserves the canonical line subbundle $\mathcal{T}^1$. If this is satisfied, one obtains a tensor field describing the induced action of the curvature on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}/\mathcal{T}^1$. (For the tractor connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ this is described by the component $W_{ij}^{\cdot k}{}_{\ell}$ from above.) The second part of the normality condition is that the Ricci-type contraction of this component vanishes identically.

Now by Theorem 16, the tractor connection $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is metric for $L(\tau)$. From the definition of $\tilde{\Psi}$, one easily verifies that for any vector field ξ , the endomorphism $\tilde{\Psi}(\xi)$ is skew symmetric for $L(\tau)$ and this immediately implies that ∇^0 is a tractor connection which is metric for $L(\tau)$. Hence to complete the proof, it suffices to prove that the Ricci-type contraction of the tensor describing the induced action of the curvature of ∇^0 on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}/\mathcal{T}^1$ vanishes identically.

Now as in the proof of Theorem 16, the curvature R^0 of ∇^0 is related to the curvature $\tilde{R}$ of $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ by

$$(24) \quad R^0(\xi, \eta) = \tilde{R}(\xi, \eta) + \tilde{\nabla}_{\xi}^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})} \tilde{\Psi}(\eta) - \tilde{\nabla}_{\eta}^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})} \tilde{\Psi}(\xi) - \tilde{\Psi}([\xi, \eta]) + [\tilde{\Psi}(\xi), \tilde{\Psi}(\eta)],$$

where $\tilde{\nabla}^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})}$ is the connection on $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ induced by $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ and the last bracket denotes the commutator of endomorphisms. Now the fact that $\tilde{\Psi}$ is concentrated in the block-lower-triangular part of the matrix says that inserting any vector field into $\tilde{\Psi}$ one obtains a map which vanishes on $\mathcal{T}^1$, and maps $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}$ to $\mathcal{T}^1$ (and also maps $\mathcal{T}$ to $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}$). This shows that the last two terms in the right hand side of (24) do not contribute to the induced map on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}/\mathcal{T}^1$ (and it also implies that the last one always vanishes).

Next, it is a standard result on induced connections that the definition of $\tilde{\nabla}^{\mathcal{T}}$ in terms of $\nabla^{\mathcal{T}}$ and the $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ -valued one-form Ψ in Theorem 16 implies that

$$(25) \quad \tilde{\nabla}_{\xi}^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})} \tilde{\Psi}(\eta) = \nabla_{\xi}^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})} \tilde{\Psi}(\eta) + [\Psi(\xi), \tilde{\Psi}(\eta)].$$

Now we have already seen above, that $\tilde{\Psi}(\eta)$ maps $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}$ to $\mathcal{T}^1$ and from the definition of Ψ it follows that $\Psi(\xi)$ vanishes on $\mathcal{T}^1$. Thus, the composition $\Psi(\xi) \circ \tilde{\Psi}(\eta)$ does not contribute to the induced map on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}/\mathcal{T}^1$. To consider the composition $\tilde{\Psi}(\eta) \circ \Psi(\xi)$, it suffices to consider the image of $\Psi(\xi)$ up to elements of $\mathcal{T}^1$, which is described by the tensor $A_a{}^b{}_c$ from Theorem 16. As we have noted in the proof of that theorem $A_a{}^b{}_c \rho_b$ vanishes along the boundary. This shows that $\Psi(\xi)$ has values in $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}$, so $\tilde{\Psi}(\eta) \circ \Psi(\xi)$ has values in $\mathcal{T}^1$ and does not contribute to the action on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}/\mathcal{T}^1$ either.

Collecting the information, we see that the difference $R^0(\xi, \eta) - \tilde{R}(\xi, \eta)$ is given by

$$\nabla_{\xi}^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})} \tilde{\Psi}(\eta) - \nabla_{\eta}^{\text{End}(\mathcal{T})} \tilde{\Psi}(\xi).$$

The first summand in this expression maps $s \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ to

$$\nabla_{\xi}^{\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{\Psi}(\eta)(s)) - \tilde{\Psi}(\eta)(\nabla_{\xi}^{\mathcal{T}} s).$$

Now we can directly compute the induced action of this on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}/\mathcal{T}^1$ by applying this to an element of the form $s = (0, \nu^{\ell}, 0)$ and computing the middle slot of the result. We do this in abstract index notation with the index i corresponding to ξ and j corresponding to η . For the first term, applying $\tilde{\Psi}$ the result is $\varphi_{j\ell} \nu^{\ell}$ in the bottom slot, and zero in the two other slots, so differentiating by $\nabla_i^{\mathcal{T}}$ according to (20), this produces $\delta_i^k \varphi_{j\ell} \nu^{\ell}$ in the middle slot. The middle slot in the second term is given (including the sign) by multiplying $\frac{1}{2} \hat{\tau}^{-1} \varphi_{jr} \gamma^{kr}$ by the top slot of the derivative in the bracket. By (17), the latter is given by

$$\hat{\tau} \rho_b \nabla_i \nu^b = -\hat{\tau} \nu^b \nabla_i \rho_b = -\hat{\tau} 2 \gamma_{il} \nu^{\ell}.$$

Collecting our results, we see that the tensor describing the action of the curvature of ∇^0 on $(\mathcal{T}^1)^{\perp}/\mathcal{T}^1$ is given by

$$W_{ij}{}^k{}_{\ell} + \delta_i^k \varphi_{j\ell} - \delta_j^k \varphi_{i\ell} - \varphi_{jr} \gamma^{kr} \gamma_{il} + \varphi_{ir} \gamma^{kr} \gamma_{j\ell}.$$

Forming the Ricci-type contraction, we get

$$W_{kj}{}^k{}_\ell + (n-2)\varphi_{j\ell} + \varphi_{kr}\gamma^{kr}\gamma_{j\ell},$$

and inserting the definition of $\varphi_{j\ell}$ one immediately verifies that this vanishes. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Aharony, S.S. Gubser, J.M. Maldacena *et al.*, Large N field theories, string theory and gravity, Phys. Rept. **323** (2000), 183–386 .
- [2] T.N. Bailey, M.G. Eastwood, and A.R. Gover, *Thomas’s structure bundle for conformal, projective and related structures*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **24** (1994), 1191–1217.
- [3] D.M.J. Calderbank and T. Diemer, Differential invariants and curved Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand sequences, J. Reine Angew. Math. **537** (2001) 67–103.
- [4] A. Čap, A.R. Gover, Tractor calculi for parabolic geometries, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **354** (2002), no. 4, 1511–1548.
- [5] A. Čap, A.R. Gover, Standard tractors and the conformal ambient metric construction, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **24**, 3 (2003) 231–259.
- [6] A. Čap, A.R. Gover, Projective compactifications and Einstein metrics, to appear in J. reine angew. Math., DOI 10.1515/crelle-2014-0036, arXiv:1304.1869
- [7] A. Čap, A.R. Gover, Scalar curvature and projective compactness, preprint arXiv:1409.1698
- [8] A. Čap, A. R. Gover, and M. Hammerl, Projective BGG equations, algebraic sets, and compactifications of Einstein geometries, J. London Math. Soc., **86** (2012), 433–454.
- [9] A. Čap, A.R. Gover, and M. Hammerl, Holonomy reductions of Cartan geometries and curved orbit decompositions. Duke Math. J. **163**, no. 5, 1035–1070.
- [10] A. Čap, A.R. Gover, and H. Macbeth, Einstein metrics in projective geometry, Geom. Dedicata **168** (2014) 235–244.
- [11] A. Čap, J. Slovák, and V. Souček, Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand sequences, Ann. of Math. **154** (2001), 97–113.
- [12] S.Y. Cheng, and S.T. Yau, On the existence of a complete Kähler metric on noncompact complex manifolds and the regularity of Fefferman’s equation, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **33** (1980), 507–544.
- [13] P. Chruściel, E. Delay, J.M. Lee, D.N. Skinner, Boundary regularity of conformally compact Einstein metrics, J. Differential Geom. **69** (2005), 111–136.
- [14] S. de Haro, K. Skenderis, and S.N. Solodukhin, Holographic Reconstruction of Spacetime and Renormalization in the AdS/CFT Correspondence, Commun. Math. Phys. **217** (2001), 595–622.
- [15] M.G. Eastwood, and V. Matveev, Metric connections in projective differential geometry in “Symmetries and overdetermined systems of partial differential equations”, 339–350, IMA Vol. Math. Appl., 144, Springer, New York, 2008.
- [16] C. Fefferman, and C.R. Graham. Conformal invariants, in: The mathematical heritage of Élie Cartan (Lyon, 1984). Astérisque 1985, Numero Hors Serie, 95–116.
- [17] C. Fefferman, and C.R. Graham. The Ambient Metric. Annals of Mathematics Studies, 178. Princeton University Press 2012.
- [18] Jörg Frauendiener, Conformal Infinity, Living Rev. Relativ., **7** (2004), 2004-1, 82pp.
- [19] H. Friedrich, Conformal Einstein evolution, The conformal structure of space-time, 1–50, Lecture Notes in Phys., 604, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [20] C.R. Graham, Volume and area renormalizations for conformally compact Einstein metrics, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo Suppl. No. **63** (2000), 31–42.
- [21] C.R. Graham, and J.M. Lee, Einstein metrics with prescribed conformal infinity on the ball. Adv. Math. **87** (1991), 186–225.
- [22] C.R. Graham, and M. Zworski, Scattering matrix in conformal geometry, Invent. Math. **152** (2003), 89–118.

- [23] M. Hammerl, P. Somberg, V. Souček, J. Silhan, On a new normalization for tractor covariant derivatives, *J. Europ. Math. Soc.* **14** no. 6 (2012) 1859–1883
- [24] M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, The holographic Weyl anomaly, *J. High Energy Phys.* 1998, no. **7**, Paper 23, 12 pp.
- [25] R. Mazzeo. The Hodge cohomology of a conformally compact metric. *J. Differential Geom.*, **28** (1988), 309–339.
- [26] R.B. Melrose, Geometric scattering theory. Stanford Lectures. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [27] R. Penrose, Asymptotic properties of fields and space-times, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10** (1963), 66–68.
- [28] R. Penrose, Zero rest-mass fields including gravitation: asymptotic behaviour, *R. Soc. London, Ser. A*, **284** (1965), 159–203.
- [29] J.A. Schouten, J. Haantjes, Beiträge zur allgemeinen (gekrümmten) konformen Differentialgeometrie, *Math. Ann.* **112** (1936), 594–629.
- [30] J.A. Schouten, J. Haantjes, Beiträge zur allgemeinen (gekrümmten) konformen Differentialgeometrie, II, *Math. Ann.* **113** (1937), 568–583.
- [31] A. Vasy, Analytic continuation and high energy estimates for the resolvent of the Laplacian on forms on asymptotically hyperbolic spaces, arXiv:1206.5454.
- [32] A. Vasy, Microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic and Kerr-de Sitter spaces (with an appendix by Semyon Dyatlov), *Invent. Math.* **194** (2013), 381–513.
- [33] J.H.C. Whitehead, Convex regions in the geometry of paths, *Quart. J. Math.* **os-3**, no. 1 (1932) 33–42.

A.Č.: FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, OSKAR–MORGENSTERN–PLATZ 1, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA, A.R.G.:DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, PRIVATE BAG 92019, AUCKLAND 1142, NEW ZEALAND;, MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, ACT 0200, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: `Andreas.Cap@univie.ac.at`

E-mail address: `r.gover@auckland.ac.nz`